Approved
G. C. C.

THE RELIGIOUS OPINIONS OF THOMAS JEFFERSON

by

William Drum Gould

(A.B. Wesleyan, 1919; B.D. Garrett, 1922)

A Dissertation

submitted in partial fulfilment of the

requirements for the

degree of Doctor of Philosophy

GRADUATE SCHOOL

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

1929

Jefferson Transportation U.S.
Extra

40997

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

"To be great," said Emerson, "is to be misunderstood." The truth of this statement was never more perfectly exemplified than in the case of Thomas Jefferson, who was probably the object of more unjust personal attacks than any other American statesman before or since. Pamphleteers misrepresented his religious opinion, and many of his enemies spread false accusations concerning his personal life. As a result, the belief became widespread that he was a "lost soul." Only very recently has he been acquitted of some of these charges. As late as 1830, the public library of Philadelphia refused a place on its shelves for works on his life and writings.[1]

A comprehensive study of his religious opinions has been grossly neglected. With the exception of the brief treatment given them by his biographers, only one monograph has been written on the subject. This is a fifteen page pamphlet by Samuel M. Crothers entitled "The Unitarianism of Thomas Jefferson." The small size of this pamphlet makes a thorough study of the subject impossible. All that the author aims to do is to establish Jefferson's Unitarian faith. Beyond that, he barely mentions Jefferson's preparation of his "Bible", and the contribution he made to the establishment of religious liberty in Virginia.[2]

---

1 - Howard Mumford Jones, America and French Culture 1750-1848 (Durham, N.C., 1927) pp. 395-396.
2 - Samuel M. Crothers, The Unitarianism of Thomas Jefferson (Boston, 1919).

It is the purpose of this treatise to make a study of all the more important phases of the problem. This will include the general rationalistic background of the age, the nature of the attacks leveled against Jefferson's religion, the various influences which had a part in the development of his religious point of view, a study of his character, his positive religious faith, the fault he found with the existing Christian system, his political idealism, and his humanitarian interests.

While material has been taken from various authoritative secondary sources, Jefferson's own words, as found in his letters and public documents, form the indispensable basis for all discussion concerning his religious opinions. In addition to the use made of the Ford and Lipscomb editions of Jefferson's writings, a careful examination has been made of the "Thomas Jefferson Papers" (deposited at the Library of Congress) down to the year 1796, when Jefferson's enemies began to publish attacks on his religion.

The writer wishes to express his deep appreciation of the invaluable aid given him by Professor George C. Cell of Boston University School of Theology, as well as of the helpful suggestions made by Professor Charles C. Tansill of The American University. He also acknowledges with gratitude the courtesies shown him by the librarians of the Library of Congress, the libraries of Harvard College and the University of Pennsylvania, Boston Public Library, the Pennsylvania Historical Society, the Merchantile Library of Philadelphia, and the public library of Malden, Massachusetts.

CHAPTER I.

LIBERAL THOUGHT IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

CHAPTER I.

LIBERAL THOUGHT IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

Jefferson belonged to the rationalistic eighteenth century[1], and any consideration of his religious opinions must, of necessity, take into account the liberal atmosphere of his age. During the first half of that century, hostile systems of thought were waging a relentless war throughout western Europe, and it looked, for a time, as if both Catholic and Protestant orthodoxy might be supplanted by a religion of the reason. This conflict was soon carried to America where the forces of enlightenment exercised a very great influence.[2] America was indebted to both England and France for the freshening breezes. From England they came for the most part as gentle zephyrs; from France, with the force of a tornado.

---

1 - Jefferson was born April 13, 1743 and died July 4, 1826. See Henry S. Randall, The Life of Thomas Jefferson (New York, 1858), Vol. I, p. 11; ibid., Vol.III, p. 544.

2 - Jones, op. cit., p. 365.

I. Rationalism in England

Three types of liberal thought in religion were developed in England, each succeeding type more extreme than the one which had gone before. The "orthodox rationalism" of John Locke was followed by the "moderate" deism of Lord Herbert of Cherbury, and this, in turn, was succeeded by "radical" deism as represented by such writers as Anthony Collins and Thomas Woolston. Each of these three types of thought was, more or less, reproduced on this side of the water.[3]

The first or mildest group of innovators sought to effect a compromise between reason and the church.[4] Of this group, Locke was, by far, the most able and influential representative. Although not numbered in the ranks of the deists, the latter all appropirated his teaching and used it as a basis for their own.[5] Indeed, he, more than any other one thinker, has been held responsible for the spread of deism in America. As late as 1800, his works were used as standard text books in the colleges.[6]

In his "Essay on the Human Understanding" (1690), Locke held that the rational demonstration of God's existence by the inductive argument affords an adequate basis for a

---

3 - Woodbridge Riley, American Thought from Puritanism to Pragmatism and Beyond (New York, 1923), pp. 54-55.
4 - Ibid., p. 54.
5 - John Oman, The Problem of Faith and Freedom in the Last Two Centuries (New York, 1906), p. 104.
6 - Jones, op. cit., pp. 366-368.

natural religion. Therefore, where truth can be discovered by either revelation or the reason, he would recommend the latter method as the more natural and certain means of approach. He realized, however, that certain elements of Christianity, such as the resurrection of the dead, belong to another realm, and cannot possibly be discovered by the unaided reason. But if not "according to" the reason, neither are they "contrary to" it. They are completely "above" it and require a revelation to make them known. On no consideration, however, should anything "contrary to" the reason be accepted.[7] In his "The Reasonableness of Christianity" (1695), he reached the conclusion that while the natural reason was sufficient to lead men to a knowledge of God, they had lost this knowledge and required a revelation to rediscover it. Revelation was further necessary as a means of making clear their moral obligations, of purifying their worship, and of encouraging them to virtue through the promise of future rewards or punishments.[8]

Although he was willing to accept most of traditional Protestantism, even defending miracles as dependable evidences of Christianity, he was convinced that many of its tenets did not meet the demands of reason, and that its essentials were very few.[9]

The "moderate" deists defended Lord Herbert of Cherbury's five "notitiae communes" as bases for a natural

---

7 - Arthur Cushman M'Giffert, Protestant Thought before Kant (New York, 1924), pp. 200-201.
8 - Ibid., pp. 206-207.
9 - Ibid., p. 206.

and universal religion,[10] and denied that God requires any duties through revealed Christianity in addition to those demanded by the reason.[11] Lord Herbert's five points included a belief in the existence of God, the obligation of man to worship him, virtue and piety as the primary elements of worship, the necessity of repenting of and forsaking one's sin, and a system of rewards and punishments.[12] True Christianity, to most of this group, was nothing more nor less than a replublication of the laws of nature.[13]

The "radical" deists scoffed at prophesies and miracles, and attacked Christianity's claim to be a divine revelation. Anthony Collins saw in prophesy the only ground on which Christianity could claim to be of divine origin. Since prophesies were never literally fulfilled, he declared that the orthodox would have to be satisfied with an allegorical interpretation. Such a method was, of course, insatisfactory to both parties. Thomas Woolston directed a similar attack against the gospel miracles. When considered as literal truths, he found them to be absurd and unworthy of the founder of Christianity. He preferred to give them an allegorical interpretation, and believed that this was the intent of those who had recorded them. He also pointed out that, even if Jesus did perform miracles, that would be no evidence of his divine mission. Even those

---

10 - Riley, op. cit., p. 54. Lord Herbert's "De Veritate" was published as early as 1624.
11 - M'Giffert, op. cit., p. 212.
12 - Oman, op. cit., p. 82.
13 - M'Giffert, op. cit., pp. 224-225.

under the influence of demons were frequently described as endowed with the same power.[14]

David Hume, who was perhaps the most distinguished exponent of a religion within the bounds of reason, pushed his critical rationalism to the verge of skepticism. He was not satisfied with any of the rational arguments for God's existence. In his "Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion" (written in 1751), he argued that our experience of causes and effects furnishes no adequate ground for inferring a cause beyond this experience.[15] We know that there is order in the universe, but why might not nature contain in itself the principle of order? He admitted, however, that, by means of a natural judgment, the mind reads in the order of nature the idea of God. Therefore, although unable to extablish its truth, he believed that the lack of any better system justified a provisional acceptance of anthropomorphic theism.[16]

---

14 - M'Giffert, op. cit., pp. 216-218. Collins's "A Discourse on the Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion" was published in 1724; Woolston's tracts between 1727 and 1729.

15 - Charles William Hendel, Jr., Studies in the Philosophy of David Hume (Princeton, 1925), p. 317.

16 - Ibid., pp. 338-347.

II. The Response in America

While the first beginnings of rationalistic thought in America go back to the last quarter of the seventeenth century, it was not until the eighteenth that it made itself felt as an independent force. The theological excesses in Calvinism produced a humanitarian reaction. It was but natural for a God whose presence was conceived of in terms of interference to be replaced by an "absentee landlord", and for a belief in man's total depravity to give way to a new faith in his freedom and perfectibility. Furthermore, the Calvinistic doctrine of arbitrary decrees was too much of a reminder of British despotism to long retain the favor of a people who were blazing new trails to political freedom.[17] A cosmopolitan immigration and a growing commercial spirit hastened the inexitable transition.[18]

In New England, the reading public early became acquainted with the writings of such English deists as Herbert, Chubb, Shaftsbury, Tindal, Wollaston, Toland, and Hume. The influence of these thinkers, however, was very indirect, since most of the references to their works were made by the clergy while condemning the prevalence of skepticism.[19]

At Harvard, echoes of the new movement could be found in the "orthodox rationalism" of Cotton Mather's "The Christian Philosopher" (1721), and of Charles Chauncy's

---

17 - Riley, op. cit., pp. 55-57.
18 - Jones, op. cit., p. 386.
19 - Vernon Stauffer, New England and the Bavarian Illuminati (New York, 1918), p. 70.

"Benevolence of the Deity" (1784).[20] When Whitefield visited the college in 1740, he found, much to his dismay, that the rationalistic Tillotson and Clarke had replaced the old evangelical writers in the affection of the students.[21]

The attitude at Yale, on the contrary, was one of stout resistance. Despite the fact that the library at New Haven contained numberous deistic works, rationalistic thought was suppressed there with a heavy hand until the coming of the revolution. This, no doubt, helps to explain Yale's reaction to extremes of free thought following the introduction of Franco-American deism.[22]

A liberal movement in theology began to develop in eastern Massachusetts under the leadership of Charles Chauncy and Jonathan Mayhew. These churchmen objected to the revival methods employed in the Great Awakening, and joined in the general protest against the polytheistic tendencies of traditional theology.[23] However, as the movement developed, its adherents became far more interested in attacking the Calvinistic doctrines of original sin and predestination, and in emphasizing the ethical aspects of religion than they were in denying the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity. Although temporarily checked by the revolution, the uncompromising character of the Edwardean theology made their break with Congregationalism only a question of

---

20 - Riley, op. cit., pp. 57-59.
21 - Jones, op. cit., p. 367.
22 - Riley, op. cit., pp. 62-66.
23 - Williston Walker, A History of the Christian Church (New York, 1919), p. 573.

time.[24]

"Moderate" deism won the allegiance of both Benjamin Franklin and Samuel Johnson, the first president of King's College, New York (now Columbia University). While a student at Yale, Johnson was warned against reading the works of Descartes, Locke and Newton. But he could not be frightened so easily. Soon after his appointment as tutor in the same institution, he made a place for all three in the college library.[25] Then followed his break with Congregationalism and his entrance into the Anglican ministry. He was an enthusiastic disciple of the Berkeleyan philosophy, developing his rationalistic views in his "Elementa Philosophica". Under his leadership, King's College occupied a position midway between New England Calvinism and the radical deism of southern intellectual centers.[26]

When only fifteen years of age, Franklin was converted to deism by reading some works of those who attacked the movement. The arguments of the deists, which were quoted in these works for purposes of refutation, appeared to Franklin to be more convincing than the refutation. He immediately accepted Lord Herbert's five points of natural religion, and became an ardent advocate of a religion within the bounds of reason.[27]

---

24 - Walker, op. cit., p. 577.
25 - Jones, op. cit., p. 366.
26 - Riley, op. cit., pp. 66-68.
27 - Ibid., pp. 68-69.

It was due to Franklin's influence that Philadelphia, in his day, was the chief intellectual center in the United States, and that the University of Pennsylvania decided to require no religious test of its instructors.[28] In 1764, his "Library Company" was in possession of more rationalistic literature than any other American library could boast of.[29]

Deism was thus making itself felt in the colonies long before the outbreak of the revolution, and orthodox leaders were already training their guns upon it. Francis Asbury made the following entry in his "Journal" for July 1, 1772:

> "I set off for Philadelphia with unprofitable company; among whom I sat still as a man dumb; and as one in whose mouth there is no reproof. They appeared so stupidly ignorant, sceptical, deistical, and atheistical, that I thought if there were no other hell, I should strive with all my might to shun that."[30]

"Radical" deism, however, had not yet put in its appearance. It became popular only after America's alliance with France, and the circulation in the states of Thomas Paine's "Age of Reason".

---

28 - Riley, op. cit., p. 76.
29 - Jones, op. cit., p. 367.
30 - "Journal of Rev. Francis Asbury" quoted in Jones, op. cit., pp. 367-368.

III. The Growing Spirit of Toleration

The advance of liberal thought in America was accompanied by a corresponding advance both in the spirit of religious toleration and in an acceptance of the contract theory of government.[31] Both these latter movements had an English rather than a French basis. As a matter of fact, the American people were as yet unacquanited with French theories.[32] Of all the English thinkers who wrote in defense of toleration and natural right, Locke no doubt played the most prominent part in making them popular.[33] Since he exercised a direct influence on Jefferson in this regard, his views will be carefully considered in the chapter dealing with the various influences to which Jefferson was subject.[34]

A broad spirit of toleration characterized most of the colleges which were founded in the eighteenth century. When Harvard was established in 1636, the government of the college was restricted to Congregationalists and Presbyterians. Now a new spirit prevailed. The College of New Jersey (Princeton), founded in 1746 for the purpose of providing Presbyterians with an educated ministry, granted freedom to all denominations. And the charter given King's College in 1754 was just as liberal in its religious provisions.[35]

---

31 - Jones, op. cit., p. 374.
32 - Ibid., p. 370, footnote.
33 - George L. Scherger, The Evolution of Modern Liberty (New York, 1904), pp. 58-59.
34 - See pages 64-70.
35 - Jones, op. cit., p. 374.

A tolerant attitude toward Roman Catholics began to develop after 1763. Before that, American newspapers had been very bitter in their denunciation of the Catholic Church, and much anti-Catholic propaganda had been circulated throughout the colonies. Many had looked upon the Puritan advance against Louisbourg as a true Protestant crusade. After England's conquest of Canada, however, anti-Catholic articles appeared very rarely in the papers.[36]

Increased respect for Catholics followed America's alliance with Catholic France. Most ministers favored the alliance and praised Louis XVI for his generosity. His edict granting toleration to Protestants (1787), as well as certain other of his liberal measures made him more popular than ever.[37]

As a result, the Catholic Church enjoyed a rapid growth during the period of the revolution. By 1785, there were 15,800 Catholics in Maryland, 7,000 in Philadelphia, 200 in Virginia and 1,500 in New York. Most of the nineteen Catholic works printed in America before 1783 were written at this time.[38]

Jews had long since secured the good will of their Gentile neighbors. In 1748, Peter Kalm, who was traveling in the colonies, found, much to his surprise, that Jews living in New York enjoyed "all the privileges common to the other inhabitants of the town".[39]

---

36 - Jones, op. cit., pp. 369-370.
37 - Bernard Faÿ, The Revolutionary Spirit in France and America (New York, 1927), p. 220.
38 - Jones, op. cit., pp. 370-372.
39 - Ibid., p. 363.

The way was thus being prepared for the separation of church and state, a step most of the colonies were ready to take when they embarked on their crusade for political independence. Rhode Island, ever since its founding, had granted all but Catholics[40] the fullest measure of religious freedom. Massachusetts, although still retaining its state church, permitted dissenters to support the church of their choice, without being taxed by the establishment. In Pennsylvania, the most any one had ever suffered for his religion was to be excluded from certain civil rights.[41] It was in Virginia that the question of religious liberty was to cause the most discussion.[42] There the principle of establishment was most firmly rooted as a state policy, and defended as a means of preserving order.[43] Baptists were being whipped and imprisoned at the very time that the colony was preparing to battle in the cause of freedom.[44] Here indeed was a challenge for liberal statesmanship, a challenge which was not unheard by that son of Virginia who was destined to become the leader of the democratic forces of his day.

---

40 - Edward Channing, A History of the United States (New York, 1905-1925), Vol. II, pp. 426-427.
41 - Sanford H. Cobb, The Rise of Religious Liberty in America (New York, 1902), pp. 482-483. At the outbreak of the revolution, Jews and Socinians were denied the right to vote, and Catholics the right to hold office in Pennsylvania. See Cobb, op. cit., p. 438.
42 - Ibid, p. 499.
43 - Ibid., p. 70.
44 - Ibid., p. 483.

IV. Political Liberalism in America.

The very fact that Rousseau's "The Social Contract" did not appear until 1762, a year after James Otis had given expression to America's revolutionary ideals, is good evidence that America looked to England rather than to France for her political philosophy.[45] French representatives of the enlightenment were too busy attacking the church during the first half of the century to pay much attention to the subject of natural right.[46] In England, however, this doctrine had been developing ever since the Independents rose to power under Cromwell.[47] Their mantle fell upon the shoulders of the whigs who, in turn, were responsible for the Glorious Revolution of 1688. Locke, their foremost political philosopher,[48] developed the theories of Richard Hooker, Hugo Grotius and John Milton, and, in his "Two Treatises of Government" made them sufficiently popular to serve as bases for both the American and the French revolutions.[49] It was these works of Locke, together with those of John Milton, Algernon Sydney, Montesquieu and the Geneva theologians which provided American love of liberty with a philosophic justification,[50] thereby transforming eight years of bloody conflict into a divinely approved crusade.

When the colonists of English extraction settled in America, they came determined to incorporate such

---

45 - Jones, op. cit., p. 369, footnote.
46 - Montesquieu was an exception. He published his "Spirit of the Laws" in 1748. See Scherger, op. cit., p. 69.
47 - Ibid., p. 121.
48 - Ibid., p. 147.
49 - Ibid., pp. 58-59.
50 - Jones, op. cit., p. 369, footnote.

ideals into their newly formed governments.[51] Their interest was religious as well as political. Indeed, it is not too much to say that their religious dissent prepared the way for their political freedom. The great majority of them had been driven from their homes in the old world by religious oppression, and were intent upon making their religious liberty secure in the land of their adoption. Congregationalists insisted on the right of each church to elect its own pastor and govern itself. And Baptists, Presbyterians, Quakers and other dissenting bodies were just as tenacious of what they considered their sacred religious rights.[52]

Governments in newly established colonies were instituted by the signing of a compact, and pure democracy prevailed until the growth of the colonies made representation necessary. The magistrate thus received his authority as a trust from the people.[53] The latter were intent both upon securing liberal charters and in seeing that their provisions were enforced. After the restoration, every colony had a legislature of its own. While they continued to recognize the overlordship of the king, they insisted that to the colonial legislatures, rather than to parliament, belonged the right of regulating their domestic affairs and of voting their own taxes.[54] They refused to recognize that British constitutional provision of 1688 which gave parliament supreme authority over all British dominions.[55]

---

51 - Scherger, op. cit., p. 176.
52 - Ibid., pp. 163-164.
53 - Ibid., p. 175.
54 - Ibid., pp. 164-166.
55 - Charles Howard McIlwain, The American Revolution (New York, 1923), pp. 9-17.

English oppression was at first resisted by an appeal to the common law of England. When, however, it was found that this did not produce the desired results, the colonists decided to base their claims on natural right.[56] They were influenced, in this respect, by John Wise's "A Vindication of the Government of New England Churches" which considered the principle of natural right in its relation both to Congregational church polity, and to the state. The edition of 1772 enjoyed a wide circulation and was used as a political text book.[57] The most influential of all the early American appeals to natural law was Samuel Adams's "Declaration of the Rights of the Colonists as Men, as Christians and as Subjects", written as a protest against making the salaries of the governor and judges of the superior court dependent on the king. It was presented to a Boston town meeting at Faneuil Hall on November 20, 1772, and was widely read both in England and in the colonies. It no doubt served as a model for the Declaration of Right prepared by the first congress of 1774, as well as for Jefferson's Declaration of Independence, (1776) and the Virginia Bill of Rights (1776).[58]

---

56 - Scherger, op. cit., p. 179.
57 - Ibid., pp. 172-175. Wise was a Congregational minister in Ipswich, Massachusetts.
58 - Ibid., p. 186.

V. French Influences in America.

Rationalism was far more radical in France than in England. This was due to the fact that thinkers in France were offered no choice but that between an irreligious type of free thought and an unenlightened form of religion. The expulsion of the Huguenots had destroyed all possibility of effecting a reconciliation between reason and the church.[59]

Voltaire, the mediator of English deism to France,[60] was a typical representative of the French rationalistic school of thought. Not satisfied with the position taken by the "moderate" English deists who advocated a Christianity cleansed of all its traditional corruptions, he would destroy the religion in its entirety. But although he was very bitter in his attacks on Christianity, and expressed a preference for atheism to intollerance and superstition, he could, nevertheless, consistently believe in God and accept a form of natural religion. He not only considered it most rational to believe in a wise, eternal and supreme creator, but he was convinced that the rejection of such a belief would be productive of widespread immorality and anarchy.[61]

Jean Jacques Rousseau, the leading French romanticist, was scarcely less rationalistic than Voltaire.

---

59 - M'Giffert, op. cit., pp. 243-244.
60 - Oman, op. cit., p. 141.
61 - M'Giffert, op. cit., pp. 244-245.

But he greatly surpassed Voltaire in his appreciation of the emotional and mystical elements in religion.[62] His slogan, like that of his century was "Back to Nature".[63] In the light of this ideal, he, like Tolstoy after him, made an attack on the "injustice, cruelty and irrationality of the existing order".

The alliance of America with France in 1778 proved to be of the utmost importance in preparing the way for the introduction of French thought into America.[64] One of the principal channels through which it flowed was the American Philosophical Society of Philadelphia, which received copies of the best scientific and philosophical works published in France, and elected to membership in its society many of the leading Frenchmen of the period. The discussions which took place in this group were carried to the south in Jefferson's correspondence.[65] Both Jefferson and Franklin made it a practise of sending the latest French works to their friends in America.[66]

It was not long before Voltaire, Raynal, Montesquieu, and Rousseau became very popular with the reading public. French works written in praise of nature and tolerance were made use of in the political struggle of the day. One of these, written by Saint Jean de Crevecoeur, which glorified "free and enlightened man" living in the forests of the

---

62 - M'Giffert, op. cit., p. 245.
63 - Oman, op. cit., p. 145.
64 - Jones, op. cit., p. 386.
65 - Ibid., p. 403.
66 - Faÿ, op. cit., p. 214.

west, attracted much attention, and parts of it were reprinted a number of times in America between the years 1782 and 1788.[67]

At the outbreak of the French revolution, all America was sympathetic with the revolutionists. Americans were not only convinced that their own revolution had been largely responsible for bringing about the French upheaval, but they were now expecting France to be the means of disseminating American ideals throughout the whole of Europe. This enthusiasm for the French cause increased in intensity during the winter of 1792-1793 when the military victories of France were reported in America. The so called "French Frenzy" was one of the most extraordinary expressions of the public mind.[68] Liberty loving Americans became so deeply attached to the watchwords of "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity" that they decided to abolish all such honorary titles as Sir, Mr. and Rev. and to substitute for them the more democratic Citizen and Citess. Wearing liberty caps and cockades, they marched to the tune of "Ça Ira", sang patriotic songs, partook of civic feasts, and erected liberty poles in honor of the new democracy.[69]

French influences were at last having their effect on the masses. By 1794, French immigration had grown large enough to warrant the publication of seven French newspapers, and Jacobin lyric poetry was the most

---

67 - Faÿ, op. cit., pp. 215-216.
68 - Stauffer, op. cit., pp. 77-78.
69 - John Bach McMaster, A History of the People of the United States from the Revolution to the Civil War (New York, 1883-1913), Vol. II, pp. 89-97.

widespread form of literature in the states. Freneau, the most noted of the poets, celebrated in verse the fall of the Bastille.[70]

The way was now made ready for the hearty reception accorded Paine's "Age of Reason" in 1794. This treatise was the sensation of the period, arousing probably more public interest than that of any other work previously circulated among the American people. Ethan Allen's "Reason the Only Oracle of Man", a bitter attack on Christian orthodoxy published some ten years earlier, had had but very little effect on contemporary thought.[71] Three causes combined to make the "Age of Reason" popular: First, its author had won the gratitude of all Americans through the publication of his revolutionary pamphlet "Common Sense". Second, it appeared at an opportune time. Most of the states and the national government had by this time guaranteed to their citizens complete religious liberty.[72] Finally, by having it published cheaply in Europe, Paine was assured of a wide circulation.[73]

It was Paine's desire to be as influential in bringing about a religious revolution in America as he had been in promoting the cause of political independence there.[74] In true Franco-American style, he attacked

---

70 - Faÿ, op. cit., pp. 344-346.
71 - Stauffer, op. cit., pp. 70-74.
72 - Riley, op. cit., pp. 86-87.
73 - Stauffer, op. cit., pp. 72-73.
74 - The Writings of Thomas Paine, edited by Moncure Daniel Conway (New York, 1894-96), Vol. IV, p. 22.

all mystery, miracle and prophesy,[75] and advocated a "religion of humanity"[76] based on the following positive creed:

> "I believe in one God, and no more; and I hope for happiness beyond this life. I believe the equality of man, and I believe that religious duties consist in doing justice, loving mercy, and endeavouring to make our fellow-creatures happy".[77]

Volney's "Les ruines ou meditations sur les révolutions des empires" (1791), which was translated by Jefferson and Joel Barlow, and printed in New York and Philadelphia, served to but strengthen the influence of the "Age of Reason". Both works had a profound effect upon the religious thought of the frontier.[78]

---

75 - Conway, op. cit., Vol. IV., p. 75.
76 - Paine coined this phrase in "The Crisis". See Conway op. cit., Vol. IV., p. 6.
77 - Ibid., Vol. IV., pp. 21-22.
78 - Jones, op. cit., p. 382. It was the Ossianic style and anti-clerical emphasis of the "Ruins" which appealed to Jefferson. He translated the first twenty chapters, but, being president at the time, considered it unwise to acknowledge the work, and authorized Joel Barlow to finish it and put his name to it. See Jones, op. cit., p. 402.

VI. Religion at a Low Ebb

Although French deism had been spread among the people ever since its introduction at the hands of French officers during the revolution,[79] it had aroused no great fear in the minds of the orthodox until the advent of the "Age of Reason".[80] Now, however, the whole nation seemed in danger of succumbing to the spirit of irreligion. The brutalizing effects of the revolution were much in evidence.[81] Many patriots who had just succeeded in freeing themselves from political bondage were ready to cast aside all religious and moral restraints as well.[82] Even after proper allowance is made for the term "atheist", Griswold's statement that atheists were comparatively more numerous and held more positions of importance during the days of Washington than at any time since, is very significant.[83]

As evidences of the irreligious tendency of the time, one might name the declining support accorded ministers and churches,[84] the neglect of tithing, the vagueness of the creeds, and the willingness of the masses to agree to a policy of complete religious liberty.[85]

---

79 - Jones, op. cit., pp. 377-378.
80 - Faÿ, op. cit., p. 345.
81 - Anson Ely Morse, The Federalist Party in Massachusetts to the Year 1800 (Princeton, 1909), p. 103.
82 - Riley, op. cit., p. 92.
83 - Jones, op. cit., p. 379.
84 - Faÿ, op. cit., pp. 219-220.
85 - Jones, op. cit., p. 380.

Educators were everywhere alarmed at the skepticism of the youth, among whom it was a widely held view that the new enlightenment would result in the complete abandonment of Christianity as an antiquated system.[86] When William Ellery Channing matriculated at Harvard in 1794, he found the religious life of that institution to be lower than it had ever been before.[87] Princeton in 1782 had but two professed Christians in the entire student body.[88] At Yale, the policy of suppression was yielding its inevitable harvest. By 1795, the college church was almost extinct,[89] and many of the students had taken the names of various English and French infidels.[90] Only one of the seventy-six members of the graduating class of 1802 was a professed Christian.[91] President Timothy Dwight described the situation as follows:

> "Youths particularly, who had been liberally educated, and who with strong passions, and feeble principles, were votaries of sensuality and ambition, delighted with the prospect of unrestrained gratification, and panting to be enrolled with men of fashion and splendour, became enamored of these new doctrines. The tenour of opinion, and even of conversation, was to a considerable extent changed at once. Striplings, scarcely fledged, suddenly found that the world had been involved in a general darkness, through the long succession of the preceding ages; and that the light of wisdom had just begun to dawn upon the human race. All the science, all the information, which had been acquired before the commencement of the last thirty or forty years, stood in their view for nothing".[92]

---

86 - Riley, op. cit., p. 92.
87 - Stauffer, op. cit., pp. 86-87.
88 - Jones, op. cit., p. 379.
89 - Stauffer, op. cit., p. 86.
90 - Ibid., p. 76, footnote.
91 - Ibid., p. 86.
92 - Timothy Dwight, Travels: In New England and New York quoted in Stauffer, op. cit., pp. 85-86.

Infidelity was even more pronounced in the south and on the frontier than it was in other parts of the land. In the south, the Catholic and Anglican clergy seemed powerless to stem the tide which swept in from France, England, and Philadelphia. On the frontier, various causes contributed to the undermining of church influence; the difficulties which lay in the way of establishing formal churches, the preference of the frontiersman for an emotional to a philosophical type of religion, and the appeal made by the "Age of Reason" to these the most dissatisfied elements of society. At the close of the century, Kentucky and Tennessee were noted for the vice and scepticism which prevailed within their borders.[93]

---

93 - Jones, op. cit., pp. 381-385.

VII. Opposition of the New England Clergy

The execution of Louis XVI in 1793 and the reign of terror which followed shortly after completely alienated the sympathy of religious conservatives from the French cause. With the leaders of the revolution professing deistic and atheistic tenets, and calling for the abolition of the old religious regime, it looked as if an alliance had been effected between the forces of anarchy and irreligion. The close relationship which had existed between America and France was now blamed for the growing movement toward scepticism and irreligion. When, therefore, the "Age of Reason" put in its appearance, ministers, newspaper editors and college authorities combined to heap upon it their most scathing denunciations.[94]

The attitude taken by the New England clergy had a political as well as a religious basis. The great majority of them were federalists[95] and sympathetic with England in her latest war with France. Democratic France, on the other hand, won the favor of the more radical republicans.[96] The publication of the treaty negotiated by John Jay between England and the United States in the autumn of 1794 gave rise to much anti-English agitation. Republicans declared that the cause of the people had been betrayed, that the

---

94 - Stauffer, op. cit., pp. 75-85.
95 - W. A. Robinson, Jeffersonian Democracy in New England (New Haven, 1916), p. 132.
96 - Stauffer, op. cit., p. 103. This war between England and France broke out in 1793.

treaty had been negotiated by a "British faction" whose sole purpose in supporting it was to injure the French republic. The federalist clergy rallied to the defense of the treaty. They considered it a religious and patriotic duty to defend federalist statesmen and laws, and to express their disapproval of the political as well as of the religious ideas of the French.[97]

A very close alliance between the New England clergy and the federalists followed the deliverance of a Thanksgiving day sermon by the Reverend David Osgood at Medford, Massachusetts on November 20, 1794.[98] In this sermon, Osgood denounced the democratic societies because of their subservience to foreign ministers, and deprecated the fact that many Americans were being won to infidelity through their blind adherence to France.[99] The great popularity of the sermon caused it to pass through six editions. Nearly every minister in New England was won to the federalist cause.[100]

The continuous stream of attacks and counter-attacks made by the federalist clergy and their republican opponents made it appear that the latter were champions of

---

97 - Stauffer, op. cit., pp. 115-119. It was but natural for the New England clergy to consider it their duty to admonish their countrymen on political matters. Since the very foundation of New England, they had exerted a great influence on public affairs, and, during the revolution, they had ably supported the cause of the colonists. Following the establishment of the national government, many of the problems which came before the public for solution had moral and religious implications which encouraged the clergy to make the most of their influence. See Stauffer, op. cit., p. 89, footnote.

98 - Morse, op. cit., p. 126.

99 - Stauffer, op. cit., pp. 89-91.

100 - Morse, op. cit., p. 126.

the cause of infidelity.[101] While federalist editors warned their countrymen against the danger of being contaminated with it, republican editors ignored it as of no real danger to the nation.[102] Worse than that, there was much truth to the charge that the works of Paine were being "industriously circulated" by various republican societies.[103] How natural to include the liberal Jefferson, a friend of Paine, in the wholesale condemnation of his party.

The most bitter attacks made by the clergy on the republicans and on France followed the publication of a work on the Illuminati by Professor John Robinson of the University of Edinburgh in 1797. Robinson revealed the fact that lodges of this organization had been organized in America, and declared their ultimate purpose to be the world-wide destruction of Christianity.[104] The clergy were further angered over the fact that the French directory was at the time insulting and threatening the United States.[105] One of the most famous sermons of the period was the one delivered by Timothy Dwight on July 4, 1798 in which we find the following appeal:

> "For what end shall we be connected with [the French] . . . that our churches may become temples of reason, our Sabbath a decade, and our psalms of praise Marseillais hymns? Is it that we may change our holy worship into a dance of Jacobin phrenzy, and that we may behold a strumphet personating a Goddess on the altars of

---

101 - Morse, op. cit., p. 129.
102 - Stauffer, op. cit., p. 83.
103 - Morse, op. cit., p. 117; Jones, op. cit., p. 382.
104 - Morse, op. cit., p. 221.
105 - Ibid., p. 169.

> J E H O V A H ? Is it that we may see the Bible cast into a bonfire, the vessels of the sacramental supper borne by an ass . . . and our children chanting mockeries against God . . . ? . . . . . Shall our sons become the disciples of Voltaire and the dragons of Marat; or our daughters the concubines of the Illuminati?"[106]

Declarations issued by the various churches sounded the same note of warning. They deplored the widespread disbelief and contempt of the gospel, as well as the lack of exemplary piety and morality on the part of the church members. The licentiousness and irreligion of the youth were considered serious enough to constitute a national apostasy.[107] The future of religion in America seemed very dark indeed.

Then came relief from an unexpected quarter. The great revivals which swept over the nation at the very close of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century brought the deistic movement to a sudden halt. The emotional appeal of the revivals proved much more attractive than the coldness and formality which were characteristic of all the rationalistic systems. Most of the clergy had remained true to orthodoxy, and the colleges preferred a synthesis of natural and revealed religion to a system of unadulterated deism.[108]

---

106 - Sermon delivered by Timothy Dwight, July 4, 1798 quoted in Morse, op. cit., p. 171.

107 - See the addresses adopted by the annual convention of the Massachusetts Congregational clergy in 1799, and by the general assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, May 17, 1798. Stauffer, op. cit., pp. 99-101.

108 - Riley, op. cit., p. 94.

CHAPTER II.

THE REACTION OF THE ORTHODOX TO JEFFERSON'S LIBERALISM

CHAPTER II.

THE REACTION OF THE ORTHODOX TO JEFFERSON'S LIBERALISM

I. Jefferson Accused of Atheism and Infidelity

Political opposition to Jefferson on the ground of his liberal religious views began as early as 1796,[1] and developed in intensity during the presidential campaigns of 1800 and 1804.[2] The very fact that he was sympathetic with the French revolution, was a student of French philosophy, and had led the forces of religious freedom to victory in Virginia was sufficient to convince the federalist clergy of New England that he was an infidel and an atheist.[3] Both they and many of their brethren in New York state (representing Congregationalist settlements)[4] raised a loud cry of warning against the election to the presidency of one whose purpose it was to abolish all religious institutions, and usher in a social order which would permit every man to do whatever he thought to be right.[5]

Others, more interested in politics than in religion, welcomed these charges as a weapon for accom-

---

1 - See pamphlet by [William Loughton Smith], The Pretentions of Thomas Jefferson to the Presidency Examined; and the Charges against John Adams Refuted (Philadelphia?, 1796).
2 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. III., p. 115.
3 - Stauffer, op. cit., pp. 120-121.
4 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 568.
5 - Stauffer, op. cit., p. 121.

plishing his defeat.[6] Admitting that Hamilton believed Jefferson's political theories to be dangerous to the nation, there is a touch of humor in the former's extraordinary zeal for Christianity. In 1800, he wrote Jay, who was then governor of New York, calling upon the latter to bend every effort to prevent "an atheist in religion, and a fanatic in politics" from being elected to the presidency. He was even willing to sanction the use of dishonorable methods to accomplish his purpose, declaring that " . . . in times like these in which we live, it will not do to be over-scrupulous".[7] Two years later, he urged the organization of "The Christian Constitutional Society" for the purpose of upholding "the Christian religion" and "the Constitution of the United States".[8]

The only written basis for these attacks was a few sentences taken from Jefferson's "Notes on Virginia", a work published in 1782.[9] The federalist pamphleteers seized on these with great avidity, and, by means of elaboration and a free use of the imagination, found their author guilty of the very worst religious offenses.

---

6 - Republican pamphleteers called attention to this fact. See [Samuel Knox], "A Vindication of the Religion of Mr. Jefferson and a Statement of his Services in the Cause of Religious Liberty. By a friend to Real Religion" in Thomas Jefferson, Notes on the State of Virginia (Baltimore, 1800), p. 15.

7 - Hamilton's suggestion was that Jay call the New York legislature for the purpose of having the electors chosen by the people in districts. This would have insured the election of a federalist candidate. See The Works of Alexander Hamilton, edited by Henry Cabot Lodge (New York, 1904), Vol. X., pp. 372-373.

8 - Ibid., Vol. X., pp. 435-437.

9 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 495.

A good example of this type of pamphlet was the much discussed "Serious Considerations on the Election of a President: . . ." Its author was a Reverend William Linn who had it published in New York during the campaign of 1800.[10] Linn was appreciative of Jefferson's talents, and of his valuable services rendered the nation, but feared the effect that the election of an irreligious candidate might have on the national welfare.[11]

The "Notes on Virginia" contained a number of passages which, to the devout orthodox, directly contradicted the Scriptures. From this, Linn drew the conclusion that Jefferson must, at least, be an unbeliever. He had rejected the biblical account of the flood on the ground that a universal deluge would have required a special creation and a subsequent annihilation of sufficient water to produce it. Linn appealed to the ipse dixit of the Scriptures, and held that a divine miracle is sufficient to explain all such mysteries.[12] Again, Jefferson had claimed that the existence of a greater number of radically different languages among the American Indians than were to

---

10 - This work drew forth a number of republican replies in defense of Jefferson's Christian faith and character. See Marcus Brutus (pseud), "Serious Facts, Opposed to 'Serious Considerations,'" in [Rev. John M. Mason], The Voice of Warning to Christians on the Ensuing Election of a President of the United States (New York, 1800). Also [De Witt Clinton], A Vindication of Thomas Jefferson against the Charges Contained in a Pamphlet Entitled, Serious Considerations &c. By Grotius (New York, 1800).

11 - [Rev. William Linn], Serious Considerations on the Election of a President (New York, 1800), p. 4.

12 - Ibid., p. 4; The Writings of Thomas Jefferson, edited by Paul Leicester Ford (New York, 1892-1899), Vol. III, pp. 116-117.

be found among their Asiatic brothers was conclusive proof that the former belonged to a more ancient stock and could not possibly have been descendants of the latter. Linn saw the whole plan of salvation at stake on this issue. For, according to the Scriptures, the gospel was to be preached to none but Adam's descendants. "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive".[13] Finally, Jefferson's intimation that Negroes might have constituted a distinct race from the very beginning was, in Linn's opinion, an inexcusable questioning of Scriptural authority.[14]

But Jefferson had done more to arouse the ire of his orthodox critic than to merely question the literal veracity of the Scriptures. He had committed the unforgiveable sin of banqueting with his friends on a Sunday.[15] He had also proposed to eliminate all religious instruction from the primary school curriculum on the ground that the minds of young children are too immature to profit by such study.[16] His statement made in defense of the principle of complete religious liberty:

> "The legitimate powers of the government extend to such acts only as are injurious to others. But it does me no injury to say there are twenty gods, or no god. It neither picks my pocket nor breaks my leg"

---

13 - I Corinthians 15:22 quoted in Linn, op. cit., pp. 8-10; Ford, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 207, footnote.

14 - Linn, op. cit., pp. 11-13; Ford, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 250.

15 - Linn, op. cit., p. 25. This banquet took place at Fredericksburg in 1798 in honor of Jefferson's election to the vice presidency. See also [Rev. John M. Mason], The Voice of Warning to Christians on the Ensuing Election of a President of the United States (New York, 1800), pp. 31-32.

16 - Linn, op. cit., pp. 14-16; Ford, op. cit., Vol. III, pp. 252-253.

was sufficient to convince Linn that even the charge of atheism was not too severe to hurl against his opponent.[17] Linn probably reasoned that toleration is guilty of all the sins it makes possible.

All kinds of rumors were accepted without question and repeated in this pamphlet. Among them was the account of an alleged conversation which had taken place between Jefferson and Mazzei. It was said that once when these two were out riding together, Mazzei had expressed his surprise that the American people should, in so many instances, fail to keep their churches in a respectable condition. Pointing to one which was in a very delapidated state, he had said, "I am astonished that they permit it to be in so ruinous a condition". To which Jefferson had replied, "It is good enough for him that was born in a manger".[18] Even granting the likelihood of such a conversation having taken place, what Jefferson no doubt had in mind was that lowly places of worship would be just as acceptable to the unpretentious Nazarine as the costliest of cathedrals.

Linn closed his work with a list of the evil effects he was expecting would follow in the wake of a Jeffersonian victory. They were three fold: First, the United States would lose the respect of foreign nations by elevating an irreligious man to her highest office. Second,

---

17 - Linn, op. cit., pp. 17-18; Ford, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 263.
18 - Linn, op. cit., pp. 16-17.

the influence of the president would serve to strengthen the forces of infidelity, which, in turn, would be productive of immorality, and thereby prepare the way for the destruction of the social order. Third, by so dishonoring God, the nation would bring upon itself his sore displeasure.[19]

Other pamphlets, written by laymen as well as by ministers, shared the same general point of view. In addition to these arguments, the Reverend John M. Mason of New York, in his "The Voice of Warning to Christians on the Ensuing Election . . ." found a good reason for suspecting Jefferson of infidelity in the political support he was receiving from the most irreligious elements in the nation.[20] He also criticized the Virginian for denying that the Jews were God's chosen people. Jefferson had expressed an opinion in his "Notes on Virginia" that "Those who labour in the earth are the chosen people of God, if ever he had a chosen people, whose breasts he has made his peculiar deposit for substantial and genuine virtue".[21] William L. Smith, in his pamphlet, found fault with Jefferson's declaration that all the various forms of religion practised in New York and Pennsylvania were good enough to preserve the peace and order of the commonwealth,[22] and falsely accused him of a total neglect of the services of worship.[23] Asbury Dickins,

---

19 - Linn, op. cit., pp. 21-28.
20 - Mason, op. cit., pp. 35-36.
21 - Ibid., pp. 17-18; Ford, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 268.
22 - Smith, op. cit., p. 37; Ford, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 265.
23 - Smith, op. cit., p. 39.

on the other hand, saw no reason for advancing any arguments in support of his charges, beginning his pamphlet with the assumption that Jefferson's infidelity was an established fact.[24]

One of the most interesting and popular of all these anti-Jeffersonian tirades was Thomas Green Fessenden's "Democracy Unveiled, . . ." a poetic satire directed against both Jefferson and the republican party. Jefferson's intimacy with Paine is here made the subject of much hostile comment. In 1801, Paine, who was in France and wished to return to the United States, wrote Jefferson requesting permission to take passage on a government vessel in the event of his election to the presidency. Since Paine was an Englishman by birth, he would have been in danger of impressment by the British, had he attempted to cross the ocean on an American merchant ship. Jefferson was only too glad of the opportunity to be of assistance to this champion of the American revolution, and arranged for his passage on the Maryland.[25] Fessenden celebrated the incident as follows:

> "Though he imported Thomas Paine,
> (For Chronicleers have lied in vain,)
> T' oppose with acrimonious vanity,
> Law, order, morals, and christianity.
>
> 'Twas right, for aught I can discover,
> To send and fetch the fellow over,
> For Freedom, by his aid may chance
> With us to flourish as in France."[26]

---

24 - [Asbury Dickins], The Claims of Thomas Jefferson to the Presidency, Examined at the Bar of Christianity. By a Layman (Philadelphia, 1800).
25 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 642-643.
26 - [Thomas Green Fessenden], Democracy Unveiled, or Tyranny Stripped of the Garb of Patriotism. By Christopher Caustic (New York, 1806), Vol. II, pp. 36-37.

The federalist clergy and associated lay pamphleteers were most successful in arousing the electorate. Many New Englanders honestly believed that the church would be in danger, and themselves persecuted, if Jefferson succeeded in winning the election of 1800.[27] Men prayed daily that he might be punished for his blasphemy.[28] And, following his election, it is reported that many of the women hid their Bibles in the clefts of rocks.[29]

---

27 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 495.
28 - W. E. Dodd, "Thomas Jefferson", in W. E. Dodd, Statesmen of the Old South (New York, 1911), p. 51.
29 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 495.

II. Orthodoxy as Represented by Timothy Dwight

As is so often the case, the attacks directed against Jefferson's religion shed more light on the mental outlook of those who were responsible for them than on the actual religious faith of him whom they attacked. One finds at the root of them all the extravagent beliefs of contemporary orthodoxy. This can best be appreciated by making a study of some such system as that developed by Timothy Dwight in his "Theology; Explained and Defended, in a Series of Sermons".

Dwight was the eighth president of Yale College, holding this office from 1795 to 1817. He was an able theologian, and, as we have already seen, was a staunch defender of the Congregational system.[30] It was in the process of preaching 173 sermons directed against the infidelity of the French that he built up a complete system of theology as found in his above mentioned work.[31]

In true Protestant style, he based his system on the literally inspired word of God. " . . . all things, pertaining to life and to godliness" were to be discovered within the covers of the Old and New Testaments.[32]

He there found God to be an eternal, immutable,[33] omnipotent,[34] omnipresent, omniscient,[35] benevolent,[36] and

---

30 - The National Cyclopaedia of American Biography (New York, 1898-1927), Vol. I, p. 168. See page 30.
31 - Jones, op. cit., p. 393.
32 - Timothy Dwight, Theology; Explained and Defended, in a Series of Sermons (Middletown, Conn., 1818-1819), Vol. II, p. 171.
33 - Ibid., Vol. I, pp. 75-76.
34 - Ibid., Vol. I, p. 107.
35 - Ibid., Vol. I, pp. 89-92.
36 - Ibid., Vol. I, pp. 143-148.

sovereign spirit[37] who is one in one sense and three in another.[38] The Trinity, he held, must not be regarded as three ontologically distinct beings as had been advocated by Jonathan Edwards, but rather as three unexplainable aspects of the one God.[39]

God's purpose in creating the universe was interpreted as the glorification of himself. Not that anything could be added to the glory which was his throughout all eternity, but that his glory might be manifested to intelligible creatures; viz., angels and men.[40] And he is desirous that the latter cooperate with him in promoting this divine purpose. Those who do so cooperate may expect endless blessings as their reward, while those who resist have nothing to look forward to but punishment at the hands of an angry creator.[41]

According to this view, God placed man in a state of trial to test his obedience.[42] The reason he permitted Adam to fall was because he knew that only after the latter had so sinned would it be possible for him to effect that good which he had in mind when he created the universe.[43] By his sin, man became subject to both temporal and eternal death. Yet, even before God pronounced his sentence on man, he had promised the redemption of Christ as a means of overcoming the penalty man was expected to bring

---

37 - Dwight, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 260.
38 - Ibid., Vol. III, p. 16.
39 - Ibid., Vol. II, p. 137.
40 - Ibid., Vol. I, pp.419-421.
41 - Ibid., Vol. I, p. 17.
42 - Ibid., Vol. I, p. 433.
43 - Ibid., Vol. I, pp. 458-461.

upon himself.[44]

Dwight found in the Scriptures an account of the covenant which God the Father had entered into with Christ from all eternity. The second member of the Trinity was promised that, if he became a propitiation and intercessor for sinners, he would be rewarded with a church which would have a glorious future.[45] Such a propitiation and intercession were absolutely necessary if sinners were to be forgiven and the moral government of God upheld. For, if God were to forgive sin without requiring a sufficient satisfaction, he would thereby either brand his law as unjust or be dishonorable in his failure to enforce it.[46] The value of Christ's atone ment lies in the infinite perfection of his divine character. Being perfect, he was able, not only to fulfil all the requirements for his own salvation, but to give himself as a propitiation for the sins of the whole world.[47] This sacrifice, however, does not make it obligatory for God to grant salvation to all mankind apart from their faith in Christ. Even after the atonement, they are just as guilty as they were before.[48] We find God's love manifested in its very highest form in his justification of man through a

---

44 - Dwight, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 476.
45 - Ibid., Vol. II, p. 213. The assumption here made that there are three individualities in the Godhead is in direct contradiction to Dwight's treatment of the Trinity as found on page 42.
46 - Dwight, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 385.
47 - Ibid., Vol. II, pp. 405-406.
48 - Ibid., Vol. II, p. 412.

simple faith in the redeemer, without having any merit of his own to offer.[49]

It was taken for granted that all the regenerate would be enabledto presevere to the end, and this notwithstanding the fact that man was supposed to be endowed with a free and independent will of his own.[50] Surely God, acting through his miraculous providences, can accomplish whatever he may desire.[51]

Men were called to a strict observance of all ten of the commandments given to Moses. As some of the "common and favourite modes of profaning the sabbath" in his day, Dwight named

> "spending our time in dress; . . . ministering to a luxurious appetite; . . . walking, or riding, for amusement; . . . writings letters of friendship; . . . visiting; and . . . reading books, which are not of a religious, but merely of a decent, character, and, ultimately, those which are formed to be the means of amusement and sport".[52]

He insisted that the only ministers endowed with divine authority are those whose position is sanctioned by the Scriptures. This group includes apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers (Ephesians 4:11). Since the offices of apostle, prophet and evangelist had long since come to an end, he claimed that the only valid ministers in his day were pastors and teachers who constituted, not two distinct orders, but only one.[53]

Death, he declared, terminates man's probationary period. While the body now becomes a corpse, the soul, which

---

49 - Dwight, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 570.
50 - Ibid., Vol. III, p. 256.
51 - Ibid., Vol. I, pp. 432-433.
52 - Ibid., Vol. IV, pp. 53-55.
53 - Ibid., Vol. V, pp. 169-171.

was created a simple substance and therefore not subject to any separation of parts,[54] returns to God to render an account of its conduct during life. The souls of the righteous enter immediately upon a state of happiness, the souls of the wicked upon a state of punishment. However, following the resurrection, the happiness of the righteous and the sufferings of the wicked become more complete.[55] Dwight was confident that punishment in the next life would be for the purpose of giving the wicked their just recompense, not for the purpose of reformation.[56] God, he declared, would be a consuming fire of wrath to the wicked.[57]

No such complicated traditional system could bear the searching light of eighteenth century scientific thought, While one finds, here and there, a marked improvement over Jonathan Edwards's reactionary teachings, its total effect was to repel all who, like Jefferson, had drunk deeply of the learning of the enlightenment. Jefferson much preferred the Unitarianism of Joseph Priestley, the "orthodox rationalism" of Conyers Middleton and the philosophy of John Locke.

---

54 - Dwight, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 369-371.
55 - Ibid., Vol. V, pp. 415-425.
56 - Ibid., Vol. I, pp. 343-344.
57 - Ibid., Vol. V, pp. 491-493.

CHAPTER III.

RELIGIOUS INFLUENCES TO WHICH JEFFERSON WAS SUBJECT

CHAPTER III.

RELIGIOUS INFLUENCES TO WHICH JEFFERSON WAS SUBJECT

I. Early Training and Environment

A. The Church

Jefferson's early religious education was that of the Church of England. This was to be expected since both his parents were members of the establishment, his father, Peter Jefferson, being a vestryman of the parish.[1] Thomas was baptized during infancy,[2] and could repeat his prayers at three or four years of age. He once declared that his second earliest recollection was of repeating the Lord's prayer on one occasion when his dinner was very late, in the hope that the preparation of his meal might thereby be hastened. His later familiarity with the Bible and with the various portions of the Anglican liturgy was no doubt due, in some measure at least, to the training he received as a boy.[3]

B. A Frontiersman's Point of View

Two factors were largely responsible for Jefferson's democratic inclinations; the influence of his father, and the influence of his frontier environment. While his mother's people, the Randolphs, were an aristocratic family,

---

1 - W.O. Stoddard, "Thomas Jefferson, Third President", in W.O. Stoddard, Lives of the Presidents (New York, 1886-1889), Vol. II, p. 182.
2 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 555.
3 - Ibid., Vol. I, p. 17.

tracing their lineage to a William Randolph of Warwickshire who had settled in Virginia about 1660, the Jeffersons ranked about half way between the "tidewater" planters and the lowest class of whites.[4] Peter Jefferson was an ardent whig, and, as magistrate, made all popular causes his own. He was most democratic in all his ways; dressing simply and speaking simply. One of his maxims was, "Never ask another to do for you what you can do for yourself".[5]

When he and Jane Randolph settled on their Shadwell estate, it was a part of the Goochland frontier. Albemarle county had not yet come into existence. Here, on April 13, 1743, Thomas was born, and, amid such surroundings, he grew to manhood.[6] Meanwhile, the causes of the west were winning his whole-hearted allegiance.

Whereas the east represented the rule of the aristocracy and the established church, the west was interested in majority rule and religious dissent. As late as 1765, the "tidewater" aristocrats, who never comprised more than a twentieth of the population, were the undisputed masters of the colony. Then an alliance effected between Patrick Henry, the leader of the western "qo'hees" and Richard Henry Lee, a discontented easterner, threatened the control exercised by the eastern "tuckahoes". The new democratic

---

4 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 5-11.
5 - Ibid., Vol. I, pp. 14-15.
6 - Ibid., Vol. I, pp. 10-11. Jefferson attended the school of the Reverend Mr. Maury, fourteen miles from Shadwell. See Randall, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 18.

party drew its support from the small farmers and hunters in the west, as well as from the small planters in the eastern counties. Jefferson became affiliated with it while still in college, and, as a result of its rise to power between the years 1769 and 1779,[7] was able to render some very valuable services to his state.[8]

C. The Influence of Professor William Small.

Of all the influences which contributed to the development of Jefferson's broad and liberal point of view, none played a more important part than those to which he was subject at William and Mary College. Here the liberty to philosophize was recognized and the scientific spirit was much in evidence.[9] In his "Autobiography", he informs us that it was from his conversations with one of the professors, a Doctor William Small of Scotland, that he received his "first views of the expansion of science & of the system of things in which we are placed", and that this liberal teacher "probably fixed the destinies" of his life. He goes on to state that frequently he, Professor Small, George Wythe, and the colonial governor, Francis Fauquier, formed a "partie quarree" at the latter's home, and that the conversations which took place on these occasions furnished him with much

---

7 - Dodd, op. cit., pp. 16-19.
8 - See page 192.
9 - Riley, op. cit., p. 77. Jefferson was a student at William and Mary College from 1760 to 1767; an undergraduate from 1760 to 1762, and a law student from 1762 to 1767. See Randall, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 21-32.

valuable instruction.[10]

Very little is known of Small beyond the fact that he was the acknowledged leader of the liberal forces in Virginia's educational system.[11] He came to America from Birmingham, and, after his return in 1764,[12] was very friendly with Erasmus Darwin and James Watt, the inventor of the steam engine.[13] Governor John Page spoke of him as "the illustrious professor of mathematics, afterwards well known as the great Dr. Small of Birmingham the darling friend of Darwin".[14] He entered upon his duties as professor of natural philosophy and mathematics at William and Mary College on October 18, 1758.[15] After introducing into the college the study of the natural sciences,[16] he was sent to England for the purpose of purchasing the necessary scientific apparatus.[17] When the chair of moral philosophy became vacant in 1760, he was appointed to this new position without being relieved of any of his old duties. He now gave up the practise of memory lessons which was the universal method of teaching in his day, and was probably the first teacher in America to introduce into the class room the modern lecture system.[18]

It was due largely to Small's influence that Virginians began to devote themselves to a study of the

---

10 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 4.
11 - William and Mary College Quarterly, Historical Magazine, Vol. III, p. 62, footnote (July, 1894); ibid., Vol. XIV, p. 76 (October, 1905).
12 - Ibid., Vol. III, p. 62, footnote (July 1894).
13 - Ibid., Vol. VI, p. 85 (October, 1897).
14 - Ibid., Vol. VI, p. 179 (January, 1898).
15 - Ibid., Vol. III, p. 62, footnote (July, 1894).
16 - Ibid., Vol. VIII, p. 159, footnote (January, 1900).
17 - Ibid., Vol. XIV, p. 76 (October, 1905).
18 - Ibid., Vol. VI, p. 179 (January, 1898).

sciences, a study which inevitably made them discontented with the old order.[19] William and Mary College was one of the principal centers of agitation both against the British government and against the church establishment.[20] Liberal religious thought was also gaining many adherents.[21]

---

19 - William and Mary College Quarterly, Historical Magazine, Vol. III, p. 63, footnote (July, 1894).
20 - Ibid., Vol. VI, pp. 179-180 (January, 1898).
21 - Ibid., Vol. VIII, p. 159, footnote (January, 1900).

II. Joseph Priestley's Contribution

Among the more direct and important of religious influences affecting Jefferson were those exerted by Joseph Priestley and Conyers Middleton. Even Jefferson himself freely acknowledged an indebtedness to both these religious leaders. In a letter addressed to John Adams, August 22, 1813, he declared himself ready to accept Priestley's "The History of the Corruptions of Christianity" (1782) and "A History of Early Opinions Concerning Jesus Christ" (1786), as well as Middleton's "A Letter from Rome" (1729) and "A Letter to Dr. Waterland" (1731) as a basis for his own faith.[22] A study of all four of these works will amply repay any one who is desirous of reconstructing Jefferson's religious point of view.

While Jefferson never went to the extreme of accepting any thinker's religious system in its entirety,[23] he would probably have taken less exception to the Priestleyan system than to any other with which he was acquainted.[24]

---

22 - Jefferson to John Adams, August 22, 1813, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IX, p. 418.

23 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 558.

24 - Joseph Priestley (1733-1804), the well known English scientist, theologian and Unitarian leader, emigrated to America in 1794, and settled at Northumberland, Pennsylvania. He was a republican in his political sympathies and became one of Jefferson's warm friends. See Philip J. Hartog, "Joseph Priestley", in The Dictionary of National Biography, edited by Sir Leslie Stephen and Sir Sidney Lee (London, reprint 1921-1922), Vol. XVI, pp. 357-365. Jefferson was of the opinion that no one surpassed Priestley in the contributions he made to the fields of religion, politics, and physics. See Jefferson to Thomas Cooper, Washington, July 9, 1809, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IX, p. 102.

He was especially well pleased both with Priestley's exposure of the corruption to which Christianity had been subject, and with his able defense of Unitarian tenets.[25]

Neither Priestley nor Middleton were attracted by contemporary deism.[26] Priestley held the revealed truths of Christianity to be established by the very fact that the first disciples believed them to be supported by sufficient evidence. He saw no reason why Jews, who for centuries had been attached to an excellent religion, should have been desirous of inventing another.[27]

However, while he accepted the Scriptures as a witness to the larger truths of Christianity, he denied their inerrancy and literal inspiration.[28] He had further discovered that primitive Christianity had been corrupted by paganism, while engaged in its conquest of the ancient world.[29] Hence his desire to separate the false from the true, the later additions from Jesus' original revelation.

In his opinion, the great central articles of the Christian faith are those which bear witness to the unity of God and the humanity of Christ.[30] He belived Jesus to have been a man commissioned by God to acquaint men with the divine mercy, to summon them to lives of virtue, and to assure

---

25 - Jefferson to William Short, Monticello, October 31, 1819, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 144.
26 - The Theological and Miscellaneous Works of Joseph Priestly, edited by J. T. Rutt (Hackney, 1817-1831), Vol. V, p. 483; The Miscellaneous Works of the Late Reverend and Learned Conyers Middleton (London, 1755), Vol. III, p. 49.
27 - Rutt, op. cit., Vol. V, pp. 483-486. All of Priestley's views treated of in this chapter have been taken from his two previously mentioned works.
28 - Rutt, op. cit., Vol. VII, pp. 58-59.
29 - Ibid., Vol. V, p. 481.
30 - Ibid., Vol. V, p. 494.

them of a future life of reward or punishment in consequence of the quality of life lived in this present world. Yet, in his acceptance of the miracles performed by Jesus, as well as of the latter's resurrection[31] and of the resurrection of all mankind,[32] he was more in accord with the orthodox than was Jefferson.

Priestley was most severe in his condemnation of all the established Protestant churches for retaining in their creeds what he regarded as perverted conceptions of the person of Christ, the nature of sin and the way of salvation.[33] As might have been expected of one of the foremost Unitarian leaders of his day, his theological interest centered about the doctrine of the person of Christ. He opposed trinitarianism on the ground that it was tritheistic,[34] and declared that one self-existent, all powerful being could account for all acts ascribed to the Son and Holy Spirit. With his materialistic denial of any spiritual principle in man, it was but logical for him to deny Jesus any preexistence, and to adhere to the Socinian rather than to the Arian school of thought.[35] Although he admitted that the divinity of God dwelt in Jesus, he insisted that it was all God's divinity, none of it Jesus'. Had Jesus been more than a man, Priestley did not see how

---

31 - Rutt, op. cit., Vol. V, p. 480.
32 - Ibid., Vol. V, p. 229.
33 - Ibid., Vol. V, p. 179.
34 - Ibid., Vol. V, pp. 88-89.
35 - Ibid., Vol. VI, pp. 49-51.

his temptations in the wilderness could have had any meaning for the apostles, or how the latter could have enjoyed such intimate relationship with him. Jesus, he felt confident, never desired their worship.[36]

These views Priestley believed were held, not only by all of the apostles[37] and gospel writers,[38] but by the great majority of church members[39] until their corruption at the hands of the Christian apologists during the latter half of the second century. He showed how the apologists sought to make Christianity attractive to educated Greeks by incorporating in their systems the doctrine of a preexistent Jesus (Logos) who had been generated from God but was distinct from him in individuality,[40] and how this teaching gradually gained universal recognition.[41] Not until the coming of Fausto Sozzini during the period of the reformation did he find that primitive Unitarianism was rediscovered to Christendom.[42] The great need of the hour was, therefore, the substitution of primitive orthodoxy for a corrupt traditional Christology.

---

36 - Rutt, op. cit., Vol. V, pp. 85-89. Priestley went beyond Fausto Sozzini in denying worship to Jesus. The original Socinians admitted him to a delegated divinity. See Walker, op. cit., pp. 452-453.
37 - Rutt, op. cit., Vol. V, p. 14.
38 - Ibid., Vol. VI, p. 19.
39 - Ibid, Vol. VII, p. 3. Priestley's error in this respect was due to the fact that he saw no great distinction between his position and that advocated by the early monarchists. See Rutt, op. cit., Vol. VI, p. 475. Some of the monarchists, as we now know, advocated a Christology which differed but little from Timothy Dwight's position as treated on page 42.
40 - Rutt, op. cit., Vol. V, pp. 24-30.
41 - Ibid., Vol. V, p. 36.
42 - Ibid., Vol. V, pp. 81-84.

Although open-minded on the question of the virgin birth, Priestley did not think the evidence strong enough to establish its truth. He was impressed with the fact, not only that Jesus was never reported as having spoken concerning it, but that, with the exception of the brief mention made of it in the first and third gospels, no reference to it appears in any of the New Testament writings.[43] The two passages which do treat of it had for Priestley too much "the air of fable" to be taken seriously.[44] After all, was it not an unimportant matter? Christians, he declared, should be concerned with Jesus' life, teachings and authority rather than with the means by which he came into the world.[45]

Other perversions of primitive Christian teaching treated by Priestley were the orthodox doctrines of predestination, original sin, and the atonement. He interpreted Paul's teaching of predestination as having reference to God's free gift of the gospel to mankind, making each individual responsible for his acceptance or rejection of it. An arbitrary decree of God, meting out eternal blessedness or damnation was most obnoxious to him. While he was willing to admit that Adam's sin had brought hard labor and death to all his descendants, he did not see how the latter could possibly be involved in Adam's guilt.[46]

---

43 - Rutt, op. cit., Vol. VII, pp. 60-67.
44 - Ibid., Vol. VII, pp. 109-110.
45 - Ibid., Vol. VII, pp. 60-61.
46 - Ibid., Vol. V, pp. 158-163.

His chief objection to the satisfaction theory of the atonement was that it detracts from our conception of God's unlimited mercy. Furthermore, if it were necessary to provide a propitiation for sin, Priestley was confident that the strict justice of God would not admit of a substitution of the innocent for the guilty. In his opinion, the sole purpose of Jesus' death and resurrection was to serve as an example of obedience to the divine will, and to prove that a future life of reward or punishment awaits every man at death.[47]

Priestley was in agreement with Dwight in his advocacy of a symbolic interpretation of the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's supper. Paganism, he declared, was primarily responsible for the view that they convey divine grace.[48] Their true value, however, lies in the fact that they are one of the recognized means by which a public profession of faith is made.[49] He considered baptism by sprinkling to be just as acceptable as immersion,[50] and favored the baptism of infants because of the obligation such an act places on the parents. The sacraments of confirmation, penance, ordination, matrimony and extreme unction were rejected in their entirety.[51]

He condemned asceticism as having no legitimate place in a religion which teaches that virtue makes men happy.[52] Gnostic dualistic systems must be blamed for its

---

47 - Rutt, op. cit., Vol. V, pp. 98-105.
48 - Ibid., Vol. V, pp. 345-348.
49 - Ibid., Vol. V, pp. 231-232; ibid., Vol. V, p. 285.
50 - Ibid., Vol. V, p. 269.
51 - Ibid., Vol. V, pp. 285-287.
52 - Ibid., Vol. V, p. 348.

extensive development within the Christian church.[53] He also traced the origin of Christian veneration of saints, angels and relics to the infiltration of pagan customs and to the worship accorded Jesus.[54]

His treatment of papal and conciliar claims was just as uncompromising. Over against the pope's claim to be the supreme head of the church as Peter's successor, Priestly called attention to the fact that we have no evidence that Peter was ever a bishop of Rome, and that, even if he were, the powers of the earliest Roman bishops were limited to a moral admonition of the members of their own particular church.[55] Nor did he believe that any council made up of imperfect men could ever justly claim to be infallible. In his opinion, no power, whether civil or ecclesiastical, should ever be given the privilege of deciding upon the validity of articles of faith.[56]

As far as the ministry was converned, he pointed out that originally the primitive church was officered by elders and deacons who were chosen by the people, and were not regarded as a class distinct from the main body of the congregation. It was with the elevation of the presbyter to the office of bishop, with the growth of church wealth, and with the clergy's seizure of civil power that the church fell under the control of the priestly class.[57]

---

53 - Rutt, op. cit., Vol. VI, p. 290.
54 - Ibid., Vol. V, pp. 180-181.
55 - Ibid., Vol. V, pp. 390-391.
56 - Ibid., Vol. V, pp. 422-425.
57 - Ibid., Vol. V, pp. 361-382.

All forms of public worship met with his approval. His only concern in this regard was in preventing an undue interest in the forms from taking the place of the true spirit of worship.[58]

---

58 - Rutt, op. cit., Vol. V, p. 293.

III. The Views Advocated by Conyers Middleton

Conyers Middleton (1683-1750) was an eminent English Anglican divine who succeeded in steering a true course between the scylla of deism and the charybdis of orthodoxy. As a representative of this middle-of-the-road type of theology, his writings proved most acceptable to Jefferson, who found them in close agreement with most of the positions defended by Priestley.

The "A Letter from Rome" was written for the purpose of exposing the pagan origin of various Roman Catholic ceremonies and practises. In this work, Middleton showed how pagan rites were first forced on Christians by the pagan emperors, then legislated against by the first Christian emperors, and finally incorporated into the Catholic system despite the opposition of many of the church fathers.[59]

He called special attention to the fact that Catholics rendered the same homage to their saints and martyrs that the ancient pagans paid their heroes and lesser Gods.[60] Both brought votive gifts to their altars and fulfilled their vows in return for all kinds of deliverances and cures.[61] As other Catholic appropriations of pagan practises he named the use of perfumes, incense and holy water in services of worship, the illumination of shrines and images by lamps and candles,[62] religious pro-

---

59 - Middleton, op. cit., Vol. V, pp. 181-183.
60 - Ibid., Vol. V, p. 127.
61 - Ibid., Vol. V, pp. 102-103.
62 - Ibid., Vol. V, pp. 93-101.

cessions,[63] the establishment of religious orders, and the provision of sanctuaries for fugitives from justice. Even the pope's claim to supreme civil and ecclesiastical power he considered a bequest of Rome's pontifex maximus rather than that of a Galilean fisherman.[64]

While declaring himself to be an uncompromising foe of a paganized Catholicism which was out of sympathy with the democratic aspirations of the people, he was, nevertheless, very desirous of living on terms of friendship with individual Catholics.[65]

In his "A Letter to Dr. Waterland", he made clear his mediating position by attacking some of the most cherished tenets of both the orthodox and the deists. In the first place, he strongly objected to two of Waterland's contentions; viz., that an effective natural religion had never existed apart from revelation, and that the Bible is a literally inspired book. He opposed the first of these statements by calling to witness the exemplary lives of many of the ancients and moderns who had no religion beyond that which their reason disclosed.[66] While he accepted the Bible as the Word of God,[67] he believed it should always be interpreted so as to conform to "the Nature and Reason of things".[68] For example, he was convinced that a literal interpretation of Jesus' command to turn the other cheek

---

63 - Middleton, op. cit., Vol. V, pp. 136-137.
64 - Ibid., Vol. V, pp. 156-160.
65 - Ibid., Vol. V, pp. 79-80.
66 - Ibid., Vol. III, pp. 4-5.
67 - Ibid., Vol. III, pp. 45-47.
68 - Ibid., Vol. III, p. 58.

and to give a cloak to him who steals one's coat would be to disregard entirely the spirit of Jesus' teaching.[69] Again, he refused to accept the Genesis account of man's fall on the ground that no loving heavenly Father would have disinherited both his children and all of their posterity after being seduced in such an unequal trial. It was more likely, thought he, that Moses, who was "learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians", made use of symbolical figures in his revelation of divine truth. Thus Adam no doubt represents the mind of man, Eve his senses, and the serpent lust or pleasure. It was due to the fact that Man's mind became seduced by lust through the weakness of his senses that he forfeited the happy state which was his in the days of his innocency.[70]

The second part of this work is an equally severe attack on the deistic position that Christianity should be supplanted by a religion of the reason. This Middleton opposed primarily on the ground that the unaided reason, in the case of the great majority of people, is not possessed of sufficient authority to serve as an adequate basis for the cultivation of virtue. He found that all the great religions of mankind drew their authority from a heavenly revelation, and felt sure that, if Christianity were ever discarded by Christendom, a state of confusion and disorder would ensue until its place was taken by some other traditional religion. Since even the deists acknowledged Christianity

---

69 - Middleton, op. cit., Vol. III, pp. 10-11.
70 - Ibid., Vol. III, pp. 18-25.

to be the best of all the traditional religions, he advised them to consider the situation more carefully before clamoring for its overthrow.

To the deistic argument that Christian precepts can be considered obligatory only in so far as they correspond to the tenets of natural religion, he replied that it is presumptuous to imagine that one's finite reason can furnish one with a perfect understanding of all the purposes of the Almighty. There is, he declared, no more reason to reject the commands of God which do not, on the surface, appear to warrant our obedience, than there is to ascribe to an evil power those works of creation which appear to be injurious to mankind.[71]

---

71 - Middleton, op. cit., Vol. III, pp. 49-63.

IV. The Influence of John Locke

A. Letters on Toleration

Locke's Letters on Toleration furnished Jefferson with a positive remedy for all the ills connected with religious establishments and religious persecution. Here he found, not only a destructive criticism of the existing order in Virginia, but an adequate theoretical basis on which to build a totally different type of social structure. When, therefore, the opportunity came to him of helping to erect such a structure, both in his native state and for the nation at large, it was to Locke that he looked for inspiration and guidance.

Locke opposed all compulsion in matters of religion on two grounds; first, the jurisdiction of the state should be strictly limited to civil concerns, and second, no true faith can exist apart from a full persuasion of mind.[72]

He began his treatise by defining a commonwealth as "a society of men constituted only for the procuring, preserving, and advancing their own civil interests". From this premise he concluded that the state's powers should be limited to the protection of its citizens' lives, liberty and property, and to the punishment of all who violate these rights.[73] Since the man who errs

---

72 - The Works of John Locke in Ten Volumes (London, 1812), Vol. VI, pp. 10-11.
73 - Ibid., Vol. VI, p. 10.

in matters of religion cannot thereby injure any one but himself, the state, he contended, can claim absolutely no just jurisdiction over the soul.[74]

He saw no reason why the state should have any more right to control a man's religious opinions than to regulate any of his strictly private affairs.[75] The mere fact that a certain practise is considered sinful is, he declared, no reason for making it punishable at the hands of the magistrate. Every one admits that covetousness and idleness are sins, yet they go unpunished.[76]

Then, too, he pointed out that force would be just as effective in the promotion of a false religion as a true one. There is no infallible judge of truth.[77] If persecution be right for the Christian, it is just as right for the pagan or Mohammedan who is firmly convinced that his religion is the only true one.[78] The statement that the church which is orthodox should have authority over the others, he met with the argument that each church considers itself orthodox and all others heretical. Not until it secures the favor of the state, however, does it advocate the persecution of those who refuse to conform. Prior to that, it is always loud in its praise of toleration.[79]

In the second place, Locke insisted that it is one's faith and inward sincerity which make one acceptable to God, and this, force is powerless to effect.[80] He ad-

---

74 - Locke, op. cit., Vol. VI, p. 18.
75 - Ibid., Vol. VI, pp. 22-23.
76 - Ibid., Vol. VI, pp. 36-37.
77 - Ibid., Vol. VI, pp. 100-101.
78 - Ibid., Vol. VI, p. 375.
79 - Ibid., Vol. VI, pp. 19-20.
80 - Ibid., Vol. VI, pp. 10-11.

mitted that a man might grow wealthy by being forced to labor at a task he did not like, or be cured of a disease by taking medicine he had no faith in, but he denied that he could ever be saved apart from a sincere belief in the efficacy of the course he was pursuing. To enfore the observance of certain rites and ceremonies or to forbid others against a man's better judgment is to offend God who demands voluntary worship.[81] Even " . . . God himself will not save men against their wills".[82]

If it be argued that persecution is of value in compelling dissenters to thoroughly examine the grounds of their religion, Locke would answer that such an examination is of no value apart from a complete liberty to judge of their value and to follow such judgment. As a matter of fact, persecution is always directed against outward non-conformity. Those who employ it would have no means of determining the extent to which the desired examination had taken place.[83]

Toleration, in Locke's opinion, is "the chief characteristical mark of the true church". Since the true Christian is one who follows Christ irrespective of his religious affiliations,[84] he considered it the church's duty to set up as conditions of membership only such stipulations as are declared in the Scriptures to be necessary to salvation.[85] He could not understand how the church of his day could be more interested in the punishment of non-conformity

---

81 - Locke, op. cit., Vol. VI, pp. 28-33.
82 - Ibid., Vol. VI, p. 24.
83 - Ibid., Vol. VI, pp. 128-132.
84 - Ibid., Vol. VI, pp. 5-7.
85 - Ibid., Vol. VI, p. 15. Locke denied that apostolic succession is a dependable sign of a true church. See Locke, op. cit., Vol. VI, p. 14.

than in the overcoming of vice which is the direct antithesis of Christian teaching. To those who stated that they persecuted dissenters because of their interest in the latter's welfare, he replied that he would believe them only when he found them persecuting their friends and the members of their own church for the sins they had committed.[86]

He was confident that the best method of effecting the conversion of non-Christians is to offer them a Christlike example of love and sympathy.[87] Persecution, he was sure, would only serve to alienate them the more.[88] But even if they persist in walking in darkness, the gospel demands that they be treated with charity and kindness, not with violence.[89] Compulsion must ever encourage hypocracy. Those who are chiefly concerned with material satisfactions, and have no great interest in any religion will always be found in the ranks of an established faith.[90]

Locke's proposed toleration, however, was not all inclusive. He would withhold it from three classes of people; viz., atheists, Catholics and any whose practises would undermine the foundation of society. His opposition to atheists was based on their lack of respect for oaths and covenants. Catholics he considered undeserving because of their teaching that faith need not be kept with heretics, and their belief that excommunicated kings forfeited their

---

86 - Locke, op. cit., Vol. VI, pp. 6-7.
87 - Ibid., Vol. VI, p. 115.
88 - Ibid., Vol. VI, p. 71.
89 - Ibid., Vol. VI, pp. 17-18.
90 - Ibid., Vol. VI, pp. 115-116.

kingdoms.[91]

B. Treatises on Government

Even more influential in the development of American institutions than his Letters on Toleration were Locke's "Two Treatises of Government", and this, notwithstanding the fact that his explanation of the origin of the state was void of all historical foundation. Political theory based on natural right and natural law proved to be the strongest foundation upon which the statesmen of the new age could possibly have built. As one should naturally expect, most of Jefferson's political writings bear witness to this influence.

According to Locke, all men are originally and naturally in a God-ordained state of perfect equality and freedom. Their equality is due to the fact that they are all members of the same species and born with the use of the same faculties. Therefore they are entitled to complete freedom of action and complete freedom in the disposal of their possessions (rights to life, liberty and property), so long as they interfere with no one else's equal rights. Reason, nature's God given law, teaches them that it is their privilege to punish all violations of these rights.[92]

Men leave this state of nature, declared Locke, be agreeing among themselves to effect the organization of a

---

91 - Locke, op. cit., Vol. VI, pp. 45-47.
92 - Ibid., Vol. V, pp. 339-343.

political society for their greater security. Without the consent of all concerned, no lawful government can ever be constituted.[93] Society now takes over their rights of legislation and punishment.[94] The value of such a society, he pointed out, is that a known authority is established to which every one may appeal for the protection of his natural rights. Since an absolute monarchy recognizes no such standing authority, it can never be a satisfactory form of government.[95]

But although Locke insisted upon the necessity of unanimous approval in the organization of a commonwealth, he held that, following such organization, the will of the majority must be supreme. He realized that it would be next to impossible to secure the consent of every individual for every act of the state, and that a great variety of opinions would render action most difficult apart from majority decisions.[96]

He urged the sharp separation of the legislative and executive departments of government on the ground that their combination would encourage corruption.[97] Of these two branches, he recognized the legislative as supreme, since it receives its authority directly from the people.[98] If it finds that the executive department is neglecting its duties, it has the right to assume responsibility for the execution of the laws and to inflict punishment on a guilty executive.[99]

---

93 - Locke, op. cit., Vol. V, pp. 394-396.
94 - Ibid., Vol. V, p. 414.
95 - Ibid., Vol. V, p. 390.
96 - Ibid., Vol. V, pp. 395-396.
97 - Ibid., Vol. V, pp. 424-425.
98 - Ibid., Vol. V, pp. 416-417.
99 - Ibid., Vol. V, p. 429.

Even the legislative power, however, has no right to rule in an arbitrary fashion. It is required by the laws of nature to govern according to established laws which protect all the natural rights of the people.[100]

No people, in Locke's opinion, should ever be obliged to obey either a usurper or a tyrant.[101] Hence, when either the legislative or executive branches of the government misuse their powers, the people have the right to dissolve the government and to organize a new one of their own choosing.[102] And the people are the sole judges as to whether or not their representatives have been faithful in the discharge of their duties.[103] He considered it far better for rulers to be always liable to deposition at the hands of the people than that the latter should ever be forced to endure tyranny.[104]

Each of the various influences considered in this chapter had its own particular part to play in the development of Jefferson's religious opinions. To determine the exact extent of each influence is, of course, impossible. Nor is it safe to say that all of them put together offer a complete explanation of his own particular views. The peculiar manner in which they were interpreted and correlated was the product, not of any one or all the influences, but of Jefferson's own individual personality.

---

100 - Locke, op. cit., Vol. V, pp. 423-424.
101 - Ibid., Vol. V, pp. 456-459.
102 - Ibid., Vol. V, pp. 468-469.
103 - Ibid., Vol. V, pp. 483-484.
104 - Ibid., Vol. V, p. 474.

CHAPTER IV.

JEFFERSON, THE MAN

CHAPTER IV.

JEFFERSON, THE MAN

I. A Firm yet Modest Leader

Jefferson was everywhere recognized as a natural leader of men. Both his voice and his appearance commanded authority. He was six feet, two and a half inches in height, stood erect and walked with firm and elastic step.[1]

His moral courage was proportionate to his physique. He was independent in forming his opinions and firm in holding to them.[2] Although ever ready to compromise in regard to practical details, he would never make any concessions to systems he considered dangerous. This characteristic was very evident in his relationship with Washington. Usually ready to defend the latter as a true friend of republican government, he nevertheless refused to support the programs of his chief when they were at variance with the dictates of his conscience.[3] It is said that "he never abandoned a plan, a principle, or a friend".[4] No one could converse with him for half an hour without being impressed with his earnestness.[5]

However, he never permitted the offices he occupied to make him conceited, realizing that pride "costs

---

1 - T. J. Randolph to H. S. Randall, in Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 675; Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 312.
2 - Ibid., Vol. I, p. 635.
3 - Ibid., Vol. II, pp. 84-85.
4 - T. J. Randolph to H. S. Randall, in Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 675.
5 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 548.

us more than hunger, thirst and cold".[6] He neither sought nor shunned public positions. When they were voluntarily offered him, he willingly accepted them and ably performed his duties.[7] He was never known to meddle with affairs in another department or to assume an air of superiority in his own. Even Hamilton, in his first newspaper attacks on Jefferson, admitted that the latter was modest and unofficious.[8]

In both his inaugural addresses, we find confessions of weakness and pleas for the indulgence of his countrymen.[9] The second contains the following appeal:

> " . . . the weakness of human nature, and the limits of my own understanding, will produce errors of judgment sometimes injurious to your interests. I shall need, therefore, all the indulgence I have heretofore experienced - the want of it will certainly not lessen with increasing years".[10]

It is of interest to note that in three cases out of four where he wrote of participating in the action of a committee of which he was chairman, he placed his name last even where it is difficult to find records which tell of his true position. For example, although he was the author of the most popular part of a "Declaration setting forth the Causes and Necessity for taking up Arms" published by the

---

6 - Jefferson to Thomas Jefferson Smith, Monticello, February 21, 1825, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 341.
7 - Nicholas Biddle, Eulogium on Thomas Jefferson Delivered before the American Philosophical Society on the Eleventh Day of April, 1827 (Philadelphia, 1827), p. 45.
8 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 635.
9 - For such a reference in Jefferson's first inaugural address, see The Writings of Thomas Jefferson, edited by Andrew A. Lipscomb (Washington, 1903), Vol. III, p. 323.
10 - Ibid., Vol. III, p. 383.

Continental congress in 1775, he allowed Dickinson to get all the credit for its authorship. He never, so far as we know, hinted that he was the author of the last four and a half paragraphs except in his "Autobiography" which was not published until after both he and Dickinson had died.[11]

Only an exceedingly modest man would have prefixed the following paragraph to a list of the invaluable services he had thus far (up to 1800?) rendered his country:

> "I have sometimes asked myself whether my country is the better for my having lived at all? I do not know that it is. I have been the instrument of doing the following things; but they would have been done by others; some of them, perhaps, a little better".[12]

---

11 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 115-116.
12 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. VII, p. 475.

II. High Ethical Standards

A. A Sensitive Conscience

Jefferson's ethical outlook had a distinctly religious basis. He believed that God has provided every one with a faithful, internal monitor known as the conscience,[13] and that virtues are, therefore, innate qualities of human nature.[14] They belong to the province of the emotions and the will rather than to that of the intellect, being too essential to man's happiness to be trusted to the intellect.[15] This being the case, the moral nature can be strengthened by exercise alone, and stands in need of but little guidance from the reason.[16] He was sure that he had never done a good deed on the suggestion of his intellect, or an evil one without it.[17] He found also that ordinary laborers, uninfluenced by artificial rules, can often decide a moral question better than the educated.[18] In one of his letters addressed to Mrs. Maria Cosway, he magnified the authority and trustworthiness of the heart by means of a dialogue carried on between his heart and his intellect. His heart asks:

> "If our country, when pressed with wrongs at the point of the bayonet, had been governed by it's heads instead of it's hearts, where should we have been now? Hanging on a gallows as high as Haman's.

13 - Jefferson to Martha Jefferson, Annapolis, December 11, 1783, in Thomas Jefferson Papers, Vol. IX, p. 1551, Library of Congress.
14 - Jefferson to P. S. Dupont De Nemours, Poplar Forest, April 24, 1816, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 24.
15 - Jefferson to Mrs. Maria Cosway, Paris, October 12, 1786, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 319.
16 - Jefferson to Peter Carr, Paris, August 10, 1787, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 428.
17 - Jefferson to Mrs. Maria Cosway, Paris, October 12, 1786, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 320.
18 - Jefferson to Peter Carr, Paris, August 10, 1787, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 428.

> You [the intellect] began to calculate & to compare wealth and numbers: we [the emotions] threw up a few pulsations of our warmest blood; we supplied enthusiasm against wealth and numbers; we put our existence to the hazard when the hazard seemed against us, and we saved our country: justifying at the same time the ways of Providence, whose precept is to do always what is right, and leave the issue to him".[19]

He advised his nephew, Peter Carr, to waste no time attending lectures on ethics, but rather to read such books as would direct the feelings, and to continually engage in a practise of the virtues.[20]

He rejoiced in the fact that Christianity was diametrically opposed to the moral vices,[21] and that, although many forms of this religion were professed in the United States, all of them inculcated such fundamental virtues as "honesty, truth, temperance, gratitude, and the love of man; . . ."[22] He had nothing but contempt for those who regarded religion as a "refuge from the despair of their loathsome vices".[23] Even apart from all religious considerations, he believed the inherent worth of virtue should make its appeal.[24] He wrote his daughter Martha on one occasion that one can have no respect for oneself or be held in high esteem by others unless one is morally good.[25] One of his favorite maxims was, "Be just, be true, love

---

19 - Jefferson to Mrs. Maria Cosway, Paris, October 12, 1786, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 320.
20 - Jefferson to Peter Carr, Paris, August 10, 1787, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 428.
21 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 100-101.
22 - Lipscomb, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 320.
23 - Jefferson to Benjamin Waterhouse, October 13, 1815, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IX, p. 532.
24 - Jefferson to Peter Carr, Paris, August 10, 1787, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 430.
25 - Jefferson to Martha Jefferson, Toulon, April 7, 1787, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 375.

your neighbor as yourself and your country more than yourself".[26]

Most conscientiously did he seek to put these principles into practise.[27] We might expect republican pamphleteers to speak of him as "Exemplary in morals",[28] but when even some of their federalist opponents admit the truth of this claim,[29] it appears to have been pretty well established. Even the most intimate members of his family; those who knew all the circumstances connected with his private life, believed him to be a model of purity and integrity.[30] In 1814, he could truthfully write Miles King:

> "Hitherto I have been under the guidance of that portion of reason which he [God] has thought proper to deal out to me. I have followed it faithfully in all important cases, to such a degree at least as leaves me without uneasiness; and if on minor occasions I have erred from its dictates, I have trust in him who made us what we are, and know it was not his plan to make us always unerring".[31]

The attacks made on his character by such political opponents as Hamilton, Sedgwick, and Marshall are very vague. Not one of them attempted to put him in the same class with Burr. This, in itself, is good testimony to his purity of life.[32]

---

26 - T. J. Randolph to H. S. Randall, in Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 672.
27 - Francis Samuel Philbrick, "Thomas Jefferson", in Encyclopaedia Britannica (New York, 1910-1911), Vol. XV, p. 303.
28 - Clinton, op. cit., p. 38.
29 - Mason, op. cit., p. 23.
30 - T. J. Randolph to H. S. Randall, in Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 672.
31 - Jefferson to Miles King, Monticello, September 26, 1814, in Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 405.
32 - Marshall, for example, stated that the morals of the author of the Mazzei letter could not be pure. See Albert J. Beveridge, The Life of John Marshall (Boston and New York, 1916-1919), Vol. II, p. 537.

Some of the federalist pamphleteers and lesser lights, however, were not so scrupulous. The greatest offender in this regard was James T. Callender, a converted republican. Callender was a Scotchman who had been guilty of publishing libels in England, and had come to this country to escape punishment for them. Shortly after his arrival, he was arrested for breaking the Sedition law, and was one of those pardoned by Jefferson when the latter became president in 1801. Jefferson further assisted him with numerous loans which were never repaid.[33] For a time, Callender was an ardent supporter of republican interests, and attacked Adams in his pamphlets. However, when Jefferson refused to make him postmaster at Richmond, he allied himself with the federalists, and published a number of vicious attacks on his benefactor's private life.[34] For evidence, he had to depend entirely on the words and affidavits of his neighbors.[35]

Up until very recently, nearly every mulatto who bore the name of Jefferson in Albemarle county claimed to be descended from the father of the democratic party. Only once did he take any notice of these accusations. When Madison Henings, a mulatto living in Ohio, claimed such descent during the campaign of 1804, Jefferson proved his

---

33 - William Eleroy Curtis, The True Thomas Jefferson (Philadelphia and London, 1901), p. 311.
34 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, pp. 18-20.
35 - McMaster, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 618-619.

innocence by his record of vital statistics which showed that the time of Henings's birth made it impossible for his ex-slave to have been his son.[36] The charge that he was the father of a beautiful slave whom he freed some time before he died is just as poorly established. Captain Edmund Bacon, who for twenty years, was Jefferson's chief overseer and business manager at Monticello, informs us that he was well acquainted with the father of the girl.[37]

Fear of Jefferson's "atheism" prompted the New England clergy to stoop to such attacks. One of their number, writing during the campaign of 1800, compared him to the wicked Rehoboam.[38] Another, in Connecticut, published a pamphlet charging him with immorality and the theft of trust funds. His denial of these unfounded accusations, in a letter to a friend, was the only attention he ever paid them.[39] Fessenden, in his "Democracy Unveiled . . .", eagerly seized on such rumors, and connected the charges of immorality with Jefferson's assertion that "it does me no injury for my neighbor to say there are twenty gods, or no god".[40] His satire reads as follows:

> "But I'll maintain he is consistent,
> His conduct hasn't a single twist in it;
> If having twenty Gods, he drives
> To have at least as many wives".[41]

---

36 - Curtis, op. cit., p. 313.
37 - Rev. Hamilton W. Pierson, Jefferson at Monticello (New York, 1862), p. 110.
38 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 567.
39 - Curtis, op. cit., pp. 309-310.
40 - See page 36.
41 - Fessenden, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 31-36.

Truly, the syllogisms of the orthodox were wonderful to behold.

B. Honest as an Individual and Public Servant

Jefferson was always strictly honest, both in his private relations and while holding public office. When informed as to the total cost of his first year in college, he wrote his guardian (probably Colonel Walker) requesting that the latter charge the entire amount of his expenses to his separate share of the property. He had been spending a large amount of money on horses, and he did not wish to use any part of the estate which rightfully belonged to his brother or sisters. His guardian replied, "No - if you have sowed your wild oats thus, the estate can well afford to pay the bill!"[42]

It is a poor rule, however, which will not suffer some exceptions. While on a visit to Turin in 1787, he discovered that, because of the superior quality of the native rice, its exportation was forbidden under pain of death. Under these circumstances, he considered smuggling justifiable, and carried some out of the city in his coat and surtout pockets, in order that he might send it to the rice producing sections of the United States.[43]

His high standard of honesty would admit of no intentional surrender to falsehood, believing as he did that no end, no matter how worthy it might be, could ever justify

---

42 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 22.
43 - Ibid., Vol. I, p. 472.

a departure from the truth.[44] ". . . no vice is so mean", he wrote Martha, "as the want of truth, and at the same time so useless".[45] He deprecated the fact that the newspapers of his day could not be relied on to print the truth, and once declared that a man would be better informed if he never read a newspaper. As a means of reform, he suggested that an editor might divide his paper into the following chapters: truths, probabilities, possibilities, and lies. Chapters three and four would then be printed only for those who wished to be deceived.[46] It must be said to his credit that whenever he himself made use of rumor or hearsay in his "Anas", he invariably labeled it as such.

He believed that governments are subject to the same moral standards as are individuals, since they are nothing more nor less than aggregates of great numbers of individuals.[47] This recognition of national obligation to the moral law is evident in the words of the Declaration of Independence: " . . . a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation".[48] "The whole art of government", he wrote again, "consists in the art of being

---

44 - T. J. Randolph to H. S. Randall, in Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, pp. 671-672.
45 - Jefferson to Martha Jefferson, Toulon, April 7, 1787, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 375.
46 - Jefferson to John Nowell, June 14, 1807, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IX, pp. 73-74.
47 - Jefferson to George Logan, Poplar Forest, November 12, 1816, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 68.
48 - James M. Beck, The Scholar in Politics ([New York?, 1914]), pp. 5-6; Ford, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 43.

honest".[49] He insisted that it is the duty of good citizens to guard against governmental corruption,[50] and called for the same care and economy in the expenditure of the public's funds as would characterize an individual in the management of his own personal finances.[51]

As president, he was very zealous in this regard. He was determined never to be guilty of nepotism, and, unlike Adams, refused to appoint even his most capable relatives to office.[52] In a letter to George Jefferson, March 27, 1801, he said:

> "The public will never be made to believe that an appointment of a relative is made on the ground of merit alone uninfluenced by family views; nor can they ever see with approbation offices, the disposal of which they entrust to their Presidents for public purposes, divided out as family property".[53]

His integrity was frequently questioned, but none of his accusers were ever able to prove their charges. On April 3, 1806, James A. Bayard declared in a deposition that he had secured certain assurances from Jefferson as conditions for his support in the election of 1801, which assurances had been conveyed to him through General Samuel Smith.[54] Not only did Jefferson brand these charges as ab-

---

49 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 446.
50 - Jefferson to Judge Spencer Roane, Monticello, March 9, 1821, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 188.
51 - Lipscomb, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 348.
52 - Jefferson to J. Garland Jefferson, Monticello, January 25, 1810, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IX, p. 270.
53 - Jefferson to George Jefferson, Washington, March 27, 1801, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. VIII, p. 38.
54 - See depositions of Bayard and Smith, in Gillespie vs. Smith, in Randall, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 613-617.

solutely false,[55] but General Smith, on April 3, 1830, wrote Bayard's sons, Richard and James denying that Jefferson had any knowledge of his (Smith's) object in questioning him upon the matters under consideration.[56]

Again, in 1822, "a Native Virginian", writing in the Baltimore Federal Republican, accused Jefferson of overdrawing his account while minister to France to the amount of $1,148. In a letter addressed to Messrs. Ritchie and Gooch, May 13, 1822, Jefferson easily cleared himself. It appears that in 1789 he drew a bill to the order of Grand and Co. on the bankers of the United States at Amsterdam for 2,800 banco florins. He was in Cowes, England when he drew the bill, and it was necessary for it to pass through both the English and French mails. Somewhere in transit it became lost, due probably to the confused state of affairs which then existed in France. Paris was, at the time, under martial law and daily executions were in order. Not until June 24, 1804 did the auditor inform Jefferson that his accounts had been closed, and that the bill drawn to the order of Grand and Co. was not on the accounts of the Amsterdam bankers. On January 24, 1809, he was sent a check for $1.148, which covered the exact amount of the bill without the inclusion of any interest for the twenty years of its use.[57]

---

55 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 311-314.
56 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 618-620.
57 - Jefferson to Messrs. Ritchie and Gooch, Monticello, May 13, 1822, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, pp. 209-213.

The original documents had been destroyed when the register's office was burned by the British in 1814, but Jefferson possessed a copy of his public account with the government.[58] He could truly say that he left the government of his country "with hands as clean as they were empty".[59]

C. Attitude Taken toward Various Amusements and Practises

Jefferson looked with great disfavor on both gambling and card playing. He found the world so full of useful and interesting occupations that he could find no excuse for such a waste of time.[60] Although the social circle in which he moved as the guest of Governor Fauquier[61] frequently found their amusement in this way, he invariably refused to join his companions in such diversions.[62] His grandson, T. J. Randolph and Edmund Bacon both testify to the fact that no cards were ever permitted to enter his home at Monticello.[63] It is therefore somewhat surprising to find in his account book records of certain gains and losses in games of chance. Never, however, were the amounts recorded very high.[64]

Speculation in government securities and in vacant lands, which became very popular during Washington's administration,[65]

---

58 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 475.
59 - T. J. Randolph to H. S. Randall, in Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 672.
60 - Jefferson to Martha Jefferson, May 21, 1787, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 389.
61 - See page 49.
62 - Stoddard, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 197-198.
63 - T. J. Randolph to H. S. Randall, in Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 672; Pierson, op. cit., p. 72.
64 - Curtis, op. cit., pp. 316-317.
65 - Channing, op. cit., Vol. IV, pp. 90-113.

was equally abhorrent to him. He opposed the former on two grounds: first, it removed capital from commercial and agricultural pursuits where it might have been productive, and second, it tended to corrupt those who engaged in it by inciting them to "habits of vice and idleness".[66] As for land speculation, he felt that the real settler who intended to improve his property should have it at the lowest cost. He would therefore never buy land merely "to take advantage of the rise".[67]

Toward the close of his life, however, when he found himself plunged into debt and in danger of losing his Monticello home, he took a somewhat different attitude toward certain forms of games of chance.[68] We find him petitioning the Virginia legislature for permission to dispose of his property by lottery, accompanying which is a defense of certain enterprises subject to chance (February 1826).[69] He now denied that such enterprises can indiscriminately be called immoral, since, to do so would place many legitimate occupations in the same category. He called attention to the fact that one cannot engage in any industry

---

66 - Jefferson to The President of the United States, Philadelphia, May 23, 1792, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. VI, p. 3.
67 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 515.
68 - Jefferson to Joseph C. Cabell, Monticello, February 7, 1826, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 372.
69 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, pp. 527-528.

without running the risk of losing while seeking to make a profit. The navigator must risk his ship, the merchant his stores, the landholder his house, and the farmer "the greatest of all gamblers", his seed, rent for the ground, depreciation of cattle and implements, and his year's labor. Yet all such occupations are essential to man's existence. Insurances, lotteries, raffles, etc., when regulated by society, he defended as often productive of good, and injurious only when excessively made use of. It was because his financial embarrassment was due, in large measure, to his enforced absence from his estate during his sixty-one years of public service that he felt he was entitled to sell his estate by lottery and save his home. But cards, dice and billiards still drew forth his vigorous condemnation.[70]

He had nothing but praise for certain other amusements. Horse racing was one of his favorite sports, and he witnessed a race whenever he had the opportunity to do so. While serving as president, he was often seen on the race courses.[71] Musical entertainments and theatrical performances also met with his hearty approval.[72]

He frowned upon indiscriminate novel reading as a great obstacle to a sound education, enchanting its devotees in a world of the imagination, and discouraging them from making a study of the plain every day facts of life. He said:

---

70 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, pp. 362-363.
71 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 68.
72 - Curtis, op. cit., p. 317.

> "When this poison infects the mind, it destroys its tone and revolts it against wholesome reading. Reason and fact, plain and unadorned, are rejected. Nothing can engage attention unless dressed in all the figments of fancy, and nothing so bedecked comes amiss. The result is a bloated imagination, sickly judgment, and disgust towards all the real businesses of life".

Even the reading of too much poetry he believed would have the same effect.[73]

Certain novels, however, as well as certain types of poetry, he could enthusiastically recommend. Novels which model their narratives on real life, and serve as a means of teaching wholesome ethics, he considered a valuable means of developing high moral character.[74] For, said he, we are so constituted that the reading of charitable and grateful acts begets in us a desire to be charitable and grateful, while the reading of evil acts fills us with abhorrence for them. And he found fictitious tales to be productive of just as great an effect in this regard as accounts of actual events. Of one thing he was certain; viz., that character is much better developed through the reading of fiction than through the reading of "all the dry volumes of ethics and divinity that ever were written".[75]

As examples of poetry which might be read with profit for the development of style and taste, he named Pope, Dryden, Thompson, Shakespeare, Moliere, Racine, and

---

73 - Jefferson to Nathaniel Burwell, Monticello, March 14, 1818, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, pp. 104-105.
74 - Ibid., Vol. X, p. 105.
75 - Jefferson to Robert Skipwith, Monticello, August 3, 1771, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 396-398.

the Corneilles.[76]

He was very moderate in both his eating and drinking.[77] To his namesake, Thomas Jefferson Smith, he wrote, "We never repent of having eaten too little".[78] He was of the opinion that excessive meat eating had an injurious effect on one's character, and laid those aspects of the Englishman's character which he did not admire to this cause.[79]

He spent a large amount of money on wine,[80] but very rarely partook of strong drink.[81] T. J. Randolph informs us that, during his last illness, his physician had difficulty in persuading him to take brandy strong enough to act as an astringent.[82] He recognized the evil of drunkenness, calling attention to the fact that it is destructive of health, morals, family life, and one's social usefulness. In order to discourage whisky drinking, and put it beyond the drunkard's grasp, he favored an additional tax on this beverage of twenty-five cents a gallon (1823). He believed it to be the duty of the government to act as the drunkard's guardian, since the latter was unable to care

---

76 - Jefferson to Nathaniel Burwell, Monticello, March 14, 1818, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 105.
77 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 35.
78 - Jefferson to Thomas Jefferson Smith, Monticello, February 21, 1825, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 341.
79 - Jefferson to Mrs. John (Abigail) Adams, Paris, September 25, 1785, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 100.
80 - Curtis, op. cit., p. 318.
81 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 35.
82 - T. J. Randolph to H. S. Randall, in Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 675.

for himself. But he was strongly opposed to any great advancement in the tax on imported wines or liquors. Since these were not drunk to excess, he would encourage their use by keeping the price low.[83]

Although a tobacco planter, he did not use tobacco himself. The Virginia aristocracy looked with disfavor on the practise of smoking.[84]

D. Comparisons Drawn between American and European Standards, and Between Rural and Urban Life.

In comparing American and European standards of morality, Jefferson found the latter to be decidedly inferior to the former, and for that reason disapproved of having American youths educated in Europe. French morals were especially displeasing to him.[85] He was impressed with the fact that the French people did not seem to enjoy such "temperate", "uniform" and "lasting" happiness as did the people of the United States, and believed this to be due, not only to the oppressive government of the former, but also to the fact that they did not cultivate home life. In a letter addressed to Mrs. Trist, August 18, 1785, he asked:

---

83 - Jefferson to Samuel Smith, Monticello, May 3, 1823, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, pp. 251-252.
84 - Stoddard, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 196.
85 - Jefferson to Charles Thompson, Paris, November 11, 1784, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 15.

> ". . . where can . . . [this] compensation be found? Perhaps they may catch some moments of transport above the level of the ordinary tranquil joy we experience, but they are separated by long intervals, during which all the passions are at sea without rudder or compass".[86]

He preferred a rural to an urban type of civilization, and expressed the hope that America would ever remain an agricultural country. The evil effects of the industrial revolution were too evident to be ignored. Agriculturalists he found to be God-fearing, independent and industrious, "the chosen people of God, if ever he had a chosen people", whereas the dependence of factory hands tended to make them subservient and venal. He was of the opinion that, generally speaking, the proportion which the sum total of all other classes of citizens bears to that of the agriculturalists is a good indication of the proportion of the unsound to the sound parts of the state in question. In his "Notes on Virginia", he declared, "The mobs of great cities add just so much to the support of pure government, as sores do to the strength of the human body". On the other hand, history had never recorded an instance in which the whole body of agriculturalists either of a given age or nation became morally corrupt.[87]

---

86 - Jefferson to Mrs. Trist, Paris, August 18, 1785, in Lipscomb, op. cit., Vol. V, pp. 80-81.

87 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. III, pp. 268-269. It should be noted, in this connection, that when Jefferson made these statements, he had in mind the corrupt and dependent state of factory hands in European cities, and was making no reference to conditions in the United States as they then existed. He rejoiced in the fact that, in this country, the presence of large areas of vacant land made it possible for laborers to retain their independence. If they were not given sufficient remuneration for their services, they could give up their positions and take to farming. See Jefferson to Lithgow, January 4, 1805, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. III, pp. 269-270.

E. Ethical Influence and Ethical Advice

The great influence which one personality may exert on another in the development of character was fully appreciated by Jefferson. In a letter to T. J. Randolph, he stated that such influences were largely responsible for the development of his own character. Being thrown on his own resources at the early age of fourteen, he often found himself in very bad company. He had the good fortune, however, to make the acquaintance of a few high-minded leaders who made a profound impression upon him. When placed in difficult circumstances, he would ask himself how these men would act in similar situations, and believed his character to have been far more influenced by these men than by any act of reasoning on his part. Indeed, he was sure that such influence is much superior to any reasoning "with the jaundiced eye of youth".[88]

Throughout his busy career, he always had time for a word of ethical advice for his young friends or loved ones. At one time, he was writing Martha that the best way to prepare for death was to always do that which her conscience approved.[89] At another, he was advising T. J. Randolph to select his companions with care, and to avoid "taverns, drinkers, smokers, idlers & dissipated persons generally; . . ."[90] In response to a request of the father

---

88 - Jefferson to Thomas Jefferson Randolph, November 24, 1808, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IX, p. 231.
89 - Jefferson to Martha Jefferson, Annapolis, December 11, 1783, in Randall, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 391.
90 - Jefferson to Thomas Jefferson Randolph, November 24, 1808, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IX, p. 233.

of his namesake, Thomas Jefferson Smith, Jefferson sent the latter a letter of ethical counsel (February 21, 1825), part of which runs as follows:

> "Adore God. Reverence and cherish your parents. Love your neighbor as yourself, and your country more than yourself. Be just. Be true. Murmur not at the ways of Providence. So shall the life into which you have entered, be the portal to one of eternal and ineffable bliss".

He enclosed with this letter a decalogue which he believed would serve as a good supplement to the ten commandments:

> "1. Never put off till to-morrow what you can do to-day.
>
> 2. Never trouble another for what you can do yourself.
>
> 3. Never spend your money before you have it.
>
> 4. Never buy what you do not want, because it is cheap; it will be dear to you.
>
> 5. Pride costs us more than hunger, thirst and cold.
>
> 6. We never repent of having eaten too little.
>
> 7. Nothing is troublesome that we do willingly.
>
> 8. How much pain have cost us the evils which have never happened.
>
> 9. Take things always by their smooth handle.
>
> 10. When angry, count ten, before you speak; if very angry, an hundred".[91]

He defined politeness as "artificial good humor" and recommended it to his young friends as an indispensable virtue. He would call their attention to the fact that by sacrificing little conveniences and preferences to others, we please them without in any way injuring ourselves. He had found politeness the best means of overcoming rudeness

---

91 - Jefferson to Thomas Jefferson Smith, Monticello, February 21, 1825, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, pp. 340-341.

in another, since it invariably mortifies one's opponent and brings him to his senses.[92]

It was but natural that, as he lay dying, his last words with the various members of his family should be largely concerned with exhortations to be virtuous and truthful.[93] His whole life had been a good illustration of the truth he had written Martha as early as 1787; viz., that in influencing others to righteousness, we become more righteous ourselves.[94]

---

92 - Jefferson to Thomas Jefferson Randolph, November 24, 1808, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IX, p. 231.
93 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, pp. 543-544.
94 - Jefferson to Martha Jefferson, Toulon, April 7, 1787, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 376.

III. Industrious, Thrifty and Methodical

Next to moral rectitude, Jefferson placed industry and activity as the most influential means to the attainment of happiness. To Martha, he wrote, "Of all the cankers of human happiness none corrodes with so silent, yet so baneful an influence as indolence. Body and mind both unemployed, our being becomes a burthen, and every object about us loathsome, even the dearest". Being aware of the fact that the habit of industry must be formed during the period of youth, if at all, he admonished her to "start from it [idleness] as you would from the precipice of a gulf". To her protestation that she was unable to master her Livy, he replied that she must apply herself more diligently to her studies and determine to master them all. He would remind her that it was a characteristic of Americans to overcome all difficulties lying in their path.[95]

On several occasions, he recommended a study of Epicurus because of the latter's tendency to discount indulgence.[96] In a letter addressed to William Short, October 31, 1819, he chided his friend for his indolence, and called attention to the fact that he could not lead an indolent life and still consider himself a consistent disciple of Epicurus. Epicurus had taught that "the indulgence which prevents a greater pleasure, or produces a

---

95 - Jefferson to Martha Jefferson, Aix en Provence, March 28, 1787, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IV, pp. 372-373.
96 - Jefferson to Charles Thomson, Monticello, January 9, 1816, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 6.

greater pain, is to be avoided". Indolence must inevitably make the body weak and the mind sluggish.[97]

Jefferson was pleased to note that in America every honest occupation was considered honorable.[98] Once, when passing the home of a neighboring blacksmith, Mr. Jessie Lewis, who continued to work at his trade although his fortune had been made, he remarked, ". . . it is such men as that who constitute the wealth of a nation, not millionaires".[99]

These principles he lived as well as taught. One of his relatives declared that he never "willingly 'wasted his time', <u>even to the extent of one minute</u>".[100] While at Shadwell in 1760, he wrote John Harvey that he thought it best to go to college at once, since, if he were to stay in the mountains, at least one fourth of his time would be taken up with company.[101] During his second and last year at college, he studied fifteen hours a day, and spent very little time with his riding horse and violin.[102] Then for five years, as a law student, he kept up the same strenuous pace.[103] T. J. Randolph, in writing of his daily routine at Monticello, tells us that, after rising at dawn, he

---

97 - Jefferson to William Short, Monticello, October 31, 1819, in Ford, <u>op. cit.</u>, Vol. X, p. 145.
98 - Jefferson to Demeunier, Monticello, April 29, 1795, in Ford, <u>op. cit.</u>, Vol. VII, p. 14.
99 - T. J. Randolph to H. S. Randall, in Randall, <u>op. cit.</u>, Vol. III, p. 673.
100 - Randall, <u>op. cit.</u>, Vol. I, p. 470, footnote.
101 - Jefferson to John Harvey, Shadwell, January 14, 1760, in Ford, <u>op. cit.</u>, Vol. I, p. 340.
102 - Randall, <u>op. cit.</u>, Vol. I, p. 24.
103.- Ibid., Vol. I, p. 32.

> "wrote and read until breakfast, breakfasted early, and dined from three to four - after breakfast read for half an hour in his public rooms or portico, in summer - visited his garden and workshops - returned to his writing and reading till one, when he rode on horseback to three or half past - dined, and gave the evening to his family and company - retired at nine, and to bed from ten to eleven".[104]

He was never known to be idle except when ill.[105] During his last illness, he could say that "the sun had not caught him in bed for fifty years".[106]

His exhortations to industry were accompanied by strong condemnations of the evil of extravagance which he regarded as one of his countrymen's greatest sins. He was convinced that the United States would be one of the happiest of nations if its citizens would live by the maxim of buying nothing they could not afford. This was proved during the revolution when, despite their deprivations, they were much happier than at the time of his writing.[107] As soon as he became involved in debt, he denied himself all unnecessary luxuries. After his retirement, he did not purchase one expensive painting or book.[108]

He was always very methodical, not only in his treatment of important matters, but even in regard to unimportant details. In his garden book, for example, there is an account of the times of planting, sprouting and ripening of all his many plants. He conscientiously numbered

---

104 - T. J. Randolph to H. S. Randall, in Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 675.
105 - Pierson, op. cit., pp.86-87.
106 - T. J. Randolph to H. S. Randall, in Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 675.
107 - Jefferson to A. Donald, Paris, July 28, 1787, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 414.
108 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, pp. 333-334.

the various plots of ground, the rows of plants, and sometimes even the separate plants in each row.[109] At Paris and Washington, he entered in the account books of his maitre d'hotel the most minute details of household expenditure. His filing, also, was done most carefully. Although his correspondence included some forty thousand letters written and received, to say nothing of the many public accounts in his possession, he could, at once, find any letter or account he might desire.[110]

---

109 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 42-43.
110 - T. J. Randolph to H. S. Randall, in Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 674.

IV. Philosophic Calm; Dislike of Quarrels

One of the most striking characteristics of Jefferson's personality was his philosophic calm, or, what Theodore Parker calls his "serenity of mind".[111] And he usually succeeded in maintaining it, even when misrepresented, slandered and ridiculed.[112] Just before his death, the "Sage of Monticello" could truthfully say that his long life had been a serene one.[113]

His face and conversation were good reflections of his character in this regard. Daniel Webster declared that "it was impossible to look on his face without being struck with the benevolent, intelligent, cheerful and placid expression".[114] Edmund Bacon adds his testimony that he never knew his employer's countenance to wear a troubled look, even in the face of disaster.[115] His conversation was cheerful, and often illustrated by anecdotes.[116] According to one of his granddaughters:

---

111 - Theodore Parker, "Thomas Jefferson", in Theodore Parker, Historic Americans (Boston, 1871), p. 279.
112 - William Johnson, Eulogy on Thomas Jefferson Delivered on Aug. 3, 1826 in the First Presbyterian Church, Charleston (Charleston, 1826), p. 7.
113 - Jefferson to Thomas Jefferson Randolph, Monticello, February 8, 1826, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 375.
114 - Edward S. Ellis, Thomas Jefferson, a Character Sketch (Milwaukee, 1903), pp. 47-48. Great Americans of History Series.
115 - Pierson, op. cit., pp. 70-71.
116 - T. J. Randolph to H. S. Randall, in Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 673.

> "He enjoyed a jest, provided it were to give pain to no one, and we were always glad to have any pleasant little anecdote for him - when he would laugh as cheerily as we could do ourselves, and enter into the spirit of the thing with as much gaiety".[117]

He was ever optimistic and had no time for needless anxiety. He had found that the evils which cause us the most pain are those which never happen.[118] An unfavorable season would but encourage him to look forward to a better one the next time. If ill luck still prevailed, he believed the chances to be doubly good for a prosperous season to be following the other two.[119] As late as 1816, he thought he could redeem his private fortunes by farming.[120] Even when face to face with poverty, he did not despond or complain. He was concerned, not for himself, but for the welfare of his children, and was prepared, if necessary, to sacrifice the home he loved so well.[121] When forced to sell his library and the most valuable part of his estate to pay his debts, he could still rejoice in the general prosperity of the nation.[122] Indeed, he felt that he had no right to complain, since his lot had been more fortunate than that of most men. Had he not been blessed with

---

117 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 343.
118 - Jefferson to Thomas Jefferson Smith, Monticello, February 21, 1825, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 341.
119 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 333.
120 - Parker, op. cit., pp. 285-286.
121 - Biddle, op. cit., pp. 37-40.
122 - G. M. Adam, "Thomas Jefferson" in Edward S. Ellis, Thomas Jefferson, a Character Sketch (Milwaukee, 1903), pp. 73-74. Great Americans of History Series.

> "Uninterrupted health, a competence for every reasonable want, usefulness to my fellow citizens, a good portion of their esteem, no complaint against the world which has sufficiently honored me, and above all a family which has blessed me by their affectn and never by their conduct given me a moment's pain; . . ."?[123]

In his old age, he declared "tranquility" to be his "summum bonum",[124] and he was consoled by a philosophy which was indifferent to both hope and fear.[125] He is reported to have said, when he realized that death was near, "I do not wish to die but I do not fear to die. Acquiescence under circumstances is a duty we are permitted to control".[126] He did die in "calm serenity"[127] with a conscience "void of offence toward God and men".

Such a quiet spirit could not easily be stirred to anger. He recognized the folly of it since it ". . . only serves to torment ourselves, to divert others, and alienate their esteem".[128] Not only did he never engage in a duel,[129] but, so far as we know, he was never even involved in a personal quarrel.[130]

---

123 - Jefferson to Thomas Jefferson Randolph, Monticello, February 8, 1826, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 375.
124 - Jefferson to Benjamin Waterhouse, Monticello, July 19, 1822, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 220; Jefferson to Richard Rush, Monticello, May 31, 1813, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IX, p. 385.
125 - Jefferson to William Short, Monticello, October 31, 1819, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 145.
126 - John Sanderson and others, "Thomas Jefferson", in John Sanderson and others, Biography of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence (Philadelphia, 1828), Vol. IV, p. 366.
127 - T. J. Randolph to H. S. Randall, in Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 672.
128 - Jefferson to Martha Jefferson, Toulon, April 7, 1787, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 375.
129 - Parker, op. cit., p. 285.
130 - Philbrick, op. cit., Vol. XV, p. 301.

All controversy was distasteful to him, both because of the unpleasant feeling it usually engenders, and also by reason of its complete ineffectiveness.[131] Conviction, he declared, comes only as a result of quiet reasoning. While he never knew of an instance where one man was able to convince another by argument, he knew of many instances where arguments led to violence. He advised T. J. Randolph to waste no time in disputing with fanatics, since men of sense never care to dispute the road with angry bulls. He would recommend Franklin's practise of replying to a delicate question by asking another.[132] It was his own custom to change the subject of conversation whenever any one expressed an opinion contrary to his own.[133]

As early as 1784, he expressed a desire to retire from public life because of the contentions which "grow daily more and more insupportable".[134] His determination, ten years later, to give up his position as secretary of state was due, primarily, to the same cause. He had none of Hamilton's love of disputation.[135]

---

131 - T. J. Randolph to W. S. Randall, in Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 673.
132 - Jefferson to Thomas Jefferson Randolph, November 24, 1808, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IX, pp. 231-233.
133 - T. J. Randolph to W. S. Randall, in Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 673.
134 - Jefferson to James Madison, Annapolis, February 20, 1784, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 406.
135 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 111.

It was inevitable that one who detested physical combat as did Jefferson should make a very poor leader in time of war. Yet it was his misfortune to be governor of Virginia when that state was invaded by the British in 1781.[136] Although Washington had warned him that Arnold might make just such an invasion, he made no preparations to meet the enemy until they were on their way up the James river.[137] When he learned that Richmond was their objective, he took flight,[138] and laid himself open to the charge of cowardice and the abandonment of his trust.[139] Again, after the assembly had moved to Charlottesville, he fled before Tarleton's advance to Carter's mountain.[140] Fessenden celebrated this incident with the following verses:

"Though his high mightiness was skittish,
When menac'd by the bullying British
The Feds are wrong to make a clatter
About the Carter - Mountain matter.

'Twas better far to make excursion,
By way of something like diversion,
Than like un-philosophic hot - head
To run the risk of being shot dead.

. . . . . .

---

136 - Philbrick, op. cit., Vol. XV, pp. 302-303.
137 - Beveridge, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 143.
138 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 298-299.
139 - Fessenden, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 13-14, footnote.
140 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 337.

But being Governor of the State,
(Some carping folks presume to say't,)
He ought t'have stood some little fray,
Smelt powder ere he ran away.

Modern philosophers know better
Than their most noble minds to fetter, -
Their new-school principles disparge
With honour, honesty and courage.

Besides, 'tis said by other some
That charity begins at home,
That each man should take care of one,
Nor fight when there is room to run".[141]

The unkind and unjust attacks leveled against him at this time induced him to give up all thought of running for another term.[142]

---

141 - Fessenden, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 8-15.
142 - Philbrick, op. cit., Vol. XV, p. 303.

V. Magnanimous, yet at Times Vindictive

Magnanimity and vindictiveness were peculiarly combined in this interesting character. Although often intolerant of ideas, he was usually very tolerant in his treatment of persons.[143] Doctor Robley Dunglison, his physician, informs us that he never heard Jefferson express hatred toward a prominent political opponent. He preferred to confine his criticism to the "malign influence" such an opponent was exerting.[144] And he was ever ready to forget a personal quarrel at the first sign of conciliation on the part of a former friend.[145]

As a member of the Continental Congress, we find him very generous in the judgment he made of his opponents. He could speak of those who looked with disfavor on a break with England as

> "good and true Whigs, moving forward to the same end, only with that degree of caution which their age, the condition of their particular constituents, or their natural tempers as men, suggested".[146]

His second inaugural address breaths forth the same spirit: ". . . let us cherish them [political opponents] with patient affection; let us do them justice, and more than justice, in all competitions of interest; . . ."[147] This tolerant and

---

143 - Parker, op. cit., p. 286; Philbrick, op. cit., Vol. XV, p. 306.
144 - Dr. Robley Dunglison to H. S. Randall, Philadelphia, June 1, 1856, in Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 670.
145 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 636.
146 - Ibid., Vol. I, p. 157.
147 - Lipscomb, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 382.

moderate policy was very displeasing to a certain faction of republicans who found fault with it during both his terms of office.[148]

So much for the brighter side of the picture. In Jefferson's case, it is by far the more prominent side. I might add that it is entirely unjust to even mention his vindictiveness unless it be remembered that his enemies attacked him just as ferociously as ever he attacked them.[149] It should also be borne in mind that the sharp language he sometimes made use of toward the close of his life was the only defense of one who was continually subject to false accusations.[150] For many years, he had calmly accepted all kinds of abuse. Shall we blame him for speaking out his mind in strictly personal letters concerning the "pious whining, hypocritical canting, lying & slandering" of his clerical foes?[151]

However, the ill will he bore Aaron Burr, John Marshall and certain other of his political opponents cannot be so easily forgiven. Even conceding that he no doubt honestly believed Burr to be guilty of treason, it is difficult to explain his eagerness to have his enemy executed. Although president of the United States, he acted as chief prosecutor in the case, did his best to make the public believe Burr guilty even before he was brought to trial, and

---

148 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 633-634.
149 - Ibid., Vol. II, p. 43.
150 - Ibid., Vol. III, p. 309.
151 - Jefferson to Horatio G. Spafford, Monticello, January 10, 1816, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 12.

sought to discredit Chief Justice Marshall's decisions.[152] He was just as unfair in his treatment of Marshall, calling for the latter's impeachment merely because he insisted that Burr be considered innocent until the evidence was sufficient to warrant his conviction.[153]

In his "Anas", Jefferson frequently made use of rumor and hearsay to reflect upon his enemies.[154] Besides, it was at least not in the best of taste to picture Washington as subject to uncontrolable passion, and given to swearing in the presence of his cabinet.[155] Jefferson's savage attack on his former chief in the famous Mazzei letter (April 24, 1796) was not only unwarranted, but must have been somewhat insincere. For while he here charged Washington with monarchistic designs upon the government,[156] he later insisted that the latter was always true to republican principles, and could not, with justice, be classed with the federalists.[157]

After all, the "Sage of Monticello" was but a man, and, as such, had his own peculiar weaknesses and imperfections to overcome. That which amazes us the most in a study of his character is the surprisingly high level on which he habitually lived.

---

152 - Beveridge, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 390.
153 - Ibid, Vol. III, pp. 530-531; Lipscomb, op. cit., Vol. III, pp. 451-452.
154 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 184; ibid., Vol. I, p. 216; Beveridge, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 562.
155 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 254.
156 - Jefferson to Phillip Mazzei, Monticello, April 24, 1796, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. VII, p. 76.
157 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 165; Jefferson to John Melish, Monticello, January 13, 1813, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IX, p. 376.

VI. Affectionate Disposition

A. Family Relations

While the welfare of all his fellow citizens was ever of vital concern to Jefferson, the inner shrine of his devotion was the family circle. During his childhood days, his most trusted confidant was his elder sister Jane. Her death at the early age of twenty-five came as a great blow to him. When an old man, he lovingly spoke of her to his granddaughters. She had been an accomplished singer, and the sound of church music always brought back memories of bygone days.[158]

He was a very affectionate husband and devoted parent,[159] sharing with his loved ones all their pleasures and sorrows.[160] They responded by fairly worshipping him.[161]

His relations with his wife[162] were well nigh ideal.[163] Just before she died in 1782, he solemnly promised her that he would never marry again, a promise which was faithfully kept. She could not bear the thought of having her children subject to a stepmother.[164] Her death left him in a kind of stupor from which he only slowly re-

---

158 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 40-41.
159 - Whitelaw Reid, "Thomas Jefferson", in Whitelaw Reid, American English Studies (New York, 1923), Vol. II, p. 68.
160 - Dr. Robley Dunglison to H. S. Randall, Philadelphia, June 1, 1856, in Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 670.
161 - Adam, op. cit., p. 73.
162 - Jefferson married Martha Wayles Skelton, a childless widow of twenty-three on January 1, 1772. See Philbrick, op. cit., Vol. XV, p. 302.
163 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 481.
164 - Stoddard, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 270.

covered, or, to use his own words, rendered him "as dead to the world as she was whose loss occasioned it".[165] He was rescued from this state by receiving a political appointment. When congress heard of his bereavement, it felt confident that he would be willing to go abroad, and appointed him one of the ministers to negotiate peace at Paris. Although the preliminaries were signed before he embarked on this enterprise, he was now again ready to serve in a public capacity.[166]

Of the six children born to Jefferson and his wife, only two daughters, Martha and Mary, survied infancy.[167] He was naturally fond of children, and was never known to speak harshly to either his children or grandchildren.[168] His great affection for his daughters is very evident in all the letters they received from him.[169] After the death of his wife, Martha was his "inseparable companion" until her marriage to Thomas Mann Randolph on February 23, 1790.[170] He spoke of it as a great comfort to be able to have both girls with him in France,[171] where he was as much a mother as a father to them. He took great delight in providing for

---

165 - Jefferson to François Jean, Chevalier De Chastellux, Ampthill, November 26, 1782, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. III, pp. 64-65.
166 - Henry Budd, Thomas Jefferson (n.p., n.d.), p. 11; Randall, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 384-388.
167 - Philbrick, op. cit., Vol. XV, p. 302.
168 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 481.
169 - Jefferson to Mary Jefferson, Paris, September 20, 1785, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 98; Jefferson to Martha Jefferson, Aix en Provence, March 28, 1787, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 374.
170 - T. J. Randolph to H. S. Randall, in Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 671.
171 - Jefferson to Martha Jefferson, May 21, 1787, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 389.

all their wants, and they, on their part, made it a practise of consulting him before making any purchases.[172] The greatest concern of his life was to see them developing in virtue and industry.[173] In 1783, he wrote Martha, "I have placed my happiness on seeing you good and accomplished; and no distress this world can now bring on me would equal that of your disappointing my hopes".[174] It was because he feared he would be unable to provide for her and for his grandchildren that he became depressed over his financial embarrassments.[175] When he died, his relatives found among his possessions locks of hair and other mementoes of his wife and children, with words of affection written on the envelopes containing them.[176]

His grandchildren claimed a large portion of his affection. They were ". . . as dear to . . . [him] as if . . . [his] own from having lived with them from their cradle, . . ."[177] He loved to talk with them and direct their sports, and they were never so happy as when following him about the grounds.[178] Following the death of his daughter Mary Eppes in 1804, and the second marriage of Mr. Eppes,

---

172 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 481-482.
173 - Jefferson to Martha Jefferson, May 21, 1787, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 389.
174 - Jefferson to Martha Jefferson, Annapolis, November 28, 1783, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 346.
175 - Jefferson to Thomas Jefferson Randolph, Monticello, February 8, 1826, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 374.
176 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 384.
177 - Jefferson to Thomas Jefferson Randolph, Monticello, February 8, 1826, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 374.
178 - Pierson, op. cit., p. 88.

Jefferson was given the general oversight of their son Francis who attended schools near his grandfather's home. In 1816, Mr, Eppes decided to send Francis to a school in North Carolina but, when Jefferson objected, permitted his son to remain in the vicinity of Monticello.[179]

B. Great Capacity for Friendship

"Agreeable society" is, in Jefferson's opinion, the first and great requisite of a happy and useful life,[180] since it "informs the mind, sweetens the temper, chears our spirits, and promotes health".[181] He called attention to the fact that the forming of friendships, like the development of the moral nature, is a function of the heart rather than of the head. While the head bids man be self sufficient, caring only for intellectual pleasures of which he cannot be robbed, the heart demands the deep and lasting pleasures of friendship, even though much heartache and sadness must invariably accompany them. "Let the gloomy monk", he wrote, "sequestered from the world, seek unsocial pleasures in the bottom of his cell! Let the sublimated philosopher grasp visionary happiness while pursuing phantoms dressed in the garb of truth! Their supreme wisdom is supreme folly; & they mistake for happiness the mere absence of pain. Had they ever felt the solid pleasure of one generous spasm of the

---

179 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 433.
180 - Jefferson to James Madison, Paris, December 8, 1784, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IV, pp. 17-18.
181 - Jefferson to James Madison, Annapolis, February 20, 1784, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 406.

heart, they would exchange for it all the frigid speculations of their lives, . . ."[182]

Jefferson took pardonable pride in the fact that wherever he went, he made "ardent and affectionate friends".[183] And he very seldom lost either a friend or a political adherent.[184] All the members of his cabinet continued through life to be numbered among his intimate friends.[185] Nor would he permit political differences to stand in the way of friendship, as is evident from his relationship with John Adams during the latter part of his life.[186] He even numbered among his personal friends the wives and daughters of well known federalist leaders.[187] His Charlottesville neighbors greatly revered him,[188] and he once expressed the regret that the large number of strangers who visited him at Monticello made it impossible for him to keep on as intimate terms

---

182 - Jefferson to Mrs. Maria Cosway, Paris, October 12, 1786, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IV, pp. 312-320.
183 - Jefferson to General Taylor, May 16, 1820, in H. B. Adams, "Thomas Jefferson and the University of Virginia", in United States Bureau of Education, Circular of Information no. 1, 1888; Contributions to American Educational History no. 2 (Washington, 1888), p. 108.
184 - Reid, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 67-68.
185 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 302.
186 - Dr. Robley Dunglison to H. S. Randall, Philadelphia, June 1, 1856, in Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 670.
187 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 302.
188 - Ibid., Vol. III, p. 548.

with them as he should have liked.[189]

His circle of close, personal friends included such figures as Thomas Paine,[190] Doctor Benjamin Rush,[191] Joseph Priestley, James Madison and John Adams. When Priestley came to America, Jefferson tried to persuade him to make his home in Virginia,[192] and after his death, wrote his son-in-law, Thomas Cooper, "I revered the character of no man living more than his".[193] Doctor Robley Dunglison commented upon the beautiful friendship which existed between Jefferson and Madison, declaring that each held the other's opinions in very high esteem. Especially did Madison seem to believe that every opinion coming from Jefferson must be correct.[194] In 1784, Jefferson wrote Madison that Monroe and Short were buying land in his vicinity, and that he was in great hopes that he (Madison) would decide to do the same. Jefferson's letter continues:

> "What would I not give [if] you could fall into the circle. With such a society I could once more venture home & lay myself up for the residue of life, quitting all it's contentions which grow daily more and more insupportable".[195]

After Adams became estranged from Jefferson, due to his misunderstanding of some of the latter's political utterances,[196]

---

189 - T. J. Randolph to H. S. Randall, in Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 674.
190 - Jefferson to Thomas Paine, Washington, March 18, 1801, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. VIII, p. 19.
191 - Jefferson to Richard Rush, Monticello, May 31, 1813, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IX, p. 385.
192 - Jefferson to Joseph Priestley, Philadelphia, January 18, 1800, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. VII, p. 407.
193 - Jefferson to Thomas Cooper, Monticello, September 1, 1807, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IX, p. 103.
194 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 549.
195 - Jefferson to James Madison, Annapolis, February 20, 1784, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 406.
196 - Jefferson to John Adams, Philadelphia, July 17, 1791, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. V, p. 355.

Rush set himself to the task of bringing about a reconciliation between the two. His efforts proved successful.[197] Jefferson was always ready to go more than half way in holding a friend.[198] When Mrs. Adams died in 1818, he sent her bereaved husband the following beautiful letter of condolence:

> "The public papers, my dear friend, announce the fatal event of which your letter of October the 20th had given me ominous foreboding. Tried myself in the school of affliction, by the loss of every form of connection which can rive the human heart, I know well, and feel what you have lost, what you have suffered, are suffering, and have yet to endure. The same trials have taught me that for ills so immeasurable, time and silence are the only medicine. I will not, therefore, by useless condolences, open afresh the sluices of your grief, nor, although mingling sincerely my tears with yours, will I say a word more where words are vain, but that it is of some comfort to us both, that the term is not very far distant, at which we are to deposit in the same cerement, our sorrows and suffering bodies, and to ascend in essence to an ecstatic meeting with the friends we have loved and lost, and whom we shall still love and never lose again. God bless you and support you under your heavy affliction".[199]

---

197 - Jefferson to Benjamin Rush, Monticello, January 21, 1812, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IX, p. 332.
198 - Jefferson to Dr. Benjamin Rush, Poplar Forest, December 5, 1811, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IX, pp. 299-301.
199 - Jefferson to John Adams, Monticello, November 13, 1818, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, pp. 113-114.

CHAPTER V.

JEFFERSON SILENT ON THE SUBJECT OF RELIGION

CHAPTER V.

JEFFERSON SILENT ON THE SUBJECT OF RELIGION

Jefferson not only made no attempt to propagate his religious opinions, but actually did all in his power to keep the public in ignorance of them. He believed that his religion was a matter which concerned only himself and God, and that the public had no right to judge concerning it.[1] "I inquire after no man's", he would say, "and trouble none with mine; . . ."[2] Was he not making it known most effectively through his conduct?[3] He was perfectly willing to submit his character to the judgment of public opinion.[4]

His correspondence on the subject of religion varied according to the attitude taken by the individual he was addressing. To the orthodox, he declined to make known his religious views. Unitarians, on the other hand, were told that he agreed with them on general principles. But only to a small number of close friends (not more than six), did he send a more detailed statement of his faith as found in his "Syllabus". This group included Benjamin Rush, John Adams and William Short.[5]

---

1 - Jefferson to Richard Rush, Monticello, May 31, 1813, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IX, p. 385.
2 - Jefferson to Miles King, Monticello, September 26, 1814, in Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 405.
3 - Jefferson to John Adams, Monticello, January 11, 1817, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 73.
4 - Jefferson to Thomas J. Randolph, November 24, 1808, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IX, p. 233.
5 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, pp. 559-561.

Political considerations were, no doubt, largely responsible for his attitude taken toward the orthodox. In a letter to George Thacher, January 26, 1824, he called attention to the fact that while the orthodox were no longer permitted to burn religious liberals, they could, by charging their opponents with heresy, turn public opinion against them.[6] The orthodox had already accused him of atheism and infidelity, and he realized that a publication of his religious views would merely lay him open to new charges. He wrote James Monroe in 1800 that it was impossible to contradict all the lies of his slanderers, for while he was engaged with one, they would be publishing twenty new ones.[7]

Another reason for his silence, especially during the latter part of his life, was his distaste for controversy and love of tranquility. After the death of Benjamin Rush in 1813, he wrote Rush's son, Richard, requesting the latter to either destroy or return that copy of the "Syllabus" which had been in his father's possession. The reason Jefferson advanced for this request was that, should his enemies gain possession of his statement of faith, he feared lest the closing years of his life should be made unhappy by their bitterness.[8] Again, some years later, when Benjamin Waterhouse sought permission to publish one of Jefferson's

---

6 - Jefferson to George Thacher, Monticello, January 26, 1824, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 289.
7 - Jefferson to James Monroe, Eppington, May 26, 1800, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. VII, p. 447.
8 - Jefferson to Richard Rush, Monticello, May 31, 1813, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IX, p. 385.

letters which ably set forth some of his religious beliefs, he replied:

> "No, my dear Sir, not for all the world. Into what a nest of hornets would it thrust my head! . . . Don Quixote undertook to redress the bodily wrongs of the world, but the redressment of mental vagaries would be an enterprise more than Quixotic. I should as soon undertake to bring the crazy skulls of Bedlam to sound understanding, as inculcate reason into that of an Athanasian. I am old, and tranquility is now my summum bonum. Keep me, therefore, from the fire and faggots of Calvin and his victim Servetus".[9]

He preferred to "receive with folded arms all their hacking & hewing".[10]

He even refrained from making known his religious convictions to the members of his family, declaring that he did not wish to assume the responsibility of directing their judgment in this regard. He was especially careful never to unsettle the young or attempt to win them to his point of view. In order, however, that his family should have no reason for believing the charges that had been hurled against him, he gave his daughter a copy of the "Syllabus" in 1803. Not until after he died in 1826, did his grandchildren come to a knowledge of its contents.[11]

---

9 - Jefferson to Dr. Benjamin Waterhouse, Monticello, July 19, 1822, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 220.
10 - Jefferson to Francis A. Van derKemp, Monticello, March 16, 1817, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 77.
11 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, pp. 560-561; ibid, Vol. III, p. 556.

CHAPTER VI.

ELEMENTS OF CHRISTIANITY APPROVED BY JEFFERSON

CHAPTER VI.

ELEMENTS OF CHRISTIANITY APPROVED BY JEFFERSON

I. Affiliation with the Church

Although Jefferson kept in touch with French philosophic thought through the American Philosophical Society and by private correspondence, he never went to the extreme of accepting the atheistic point of view advanced by Diderot, D'Alembert and Holbach.[1] He once commented upon the fact that whereas atheism was popular in Catholic countries, Protestant liberals were usually content to remain within deistic limits.[2]

His closest friends were impressed with his devout religious spirit.[3] Some of them who had known him for twenty or thirty years declared that they had never heard him speak reproachfully of any man's religion,[4] or ever indulge in profanity.[5] Randall vouches for the truth of the following story coming as it did from a friend who had heard it repeated many times by the minister in question: Once when Jefferson stopped for the night at Ford's Tavern (Virginia), a minister who did not know him engaged him in conversation.

---

1 - Jones, op. cit., pp. 402-403.
2 - Riley, op. cit., pp. 80-81.
3 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 17.
4 - Ibid., Vol. III, p. 555.
5 - T. J. Randolph to H. S. Randall, in Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 672; Pierson, op. cit., p. 72.

At first the minister spoke of mechanics, and Jefferson's replies convinced him that his unknown companion was an able engineer. He then broached the subject of agriculture, and Jefferson's knowledge of this field made him sure his "engineer" was a successful farmer. Finally, the minister introduced the subject of religion, only to come to the conclusion that Jefferson was another minister, although he admitted, "he could not discover to what particular persuasion he leaned!" The next morning, he asked the landlord who his companion of the night before had been, and, when informed that he was Thomas Jefferson, said, "I tell you that was neither an atheist nor irreligious man - one of juster sentiments I never met with".[6]

Despite his liberal leanings, Jefferson was a lifelong member of the Episcopal Church.[7] He began his public career as a parish vestryman,[8] was married by an Anglican minister, and had his children baptized according to Anglican rites.[9] It might, of course, be urged that this was the fashionable thingfor any one to do who aspired to popularity or power in Virginia. Jefferson's interest in the church, however, was more than a perfunctory one. He was especially well pleased with the religious situation which existed in Charlottesville, where Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Metho-

---

6 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 345.
7 - Stoddard, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 207.
8 - Philbrick, op. cit., Vol. XV, p. 302.
9 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 555.

dists and Baptists met together every Sunday in the courthouse for a religious service which was conducted by a minister of one of the denominations participating.[10] The ministers who officiated in his neighborhood were above the average,[11] and he attended the services as regularly as did most of the other members. Sometimes, when his family remained at home, he went alone on horseback. He gave generously to the churches and ministers, frequently urging his own minister to accept a special contribution to help meet some extra expense.[12] He drew the plan for the Episcopal Church which was erected in Charlottesville, contributed liberally to its building fund, and regularly to the support of its minister.[13] When attending his own church, he always carried with him his prayer book, and took part in the responses and prayers.[14] It is known that he preferred psalm tunes to hymns, considering the latter not sufficiently dignified for purposes of worship.[15] After he died, T. J. Randolph paid his subscription of $200 toward the erection of the Charlottesville Presbyterian Church.[16]

---

10 - Jefferson to Dr. Thomas Cooper, Monticello, November 2, 1822, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 242.
11 - Stoddard, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 207.
12 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 555.
13 - T. J. Randolph to H. S. Randall, in Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 672.
14 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 555.
15 - Ibid., Vol. I, p. 41.
16 - T. J. Randolph to H. S. Randall in Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 672.

II. Unitarianism, a Restoration of Primitive Christianity

It is not surprising that Jefferson is usually classed as a deist. His general silence on the subject of religion, together with the few liberal opinions he did occasionally make public, were sufficient to convince most of his contemporaries that, if he were not a full-grown atheist, he must at least be a confirmed deist. "The Temple of Reason", a deistic magazine published during the early years of the nineteenth century, stated, in its issue for January 7, 1802, that the purpose of its publication was to defend Jefferson's religious principles.[17] But Jefferson was not a deist.[18] He may, it is true, have had deistic leanings as a young man,[19] but as soon as he began to confide his religious opinions to some of his friends (1803), we find him a decided Unitarian. Priestley's "The History of the Corruptions of Christianity" and "A History of Early Opinions Concerning Jesus Christ" had made a lasting impression upon him,[20] and he was ready to reveal, to a few of his most intimate friends, "the result[s] of a life of inquiry & reflection, . . . "[21]

---

17 - The Temple of Reason, January 7, 1802.

18 - Jefferson's unreserved approval of Middleton's "A Letter to Dr. Waterland" is, in itself, sufficient proof of this fact. See pages 62-63.

19 - Jefferson's "Scrap Book", for example, contains a number of excerpts taken from Bolingbroke's essays.

20 - Jefferson to John Adams, August 22, 1813, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IX, p. 418. "The History of the Corruptions of Christianity" was published in 1782; "A History of Early Opinions Concerning Jesus Christ" in 1786.

21 - Jefferson to Dr. Benjamin Rush, Washington, April 21, 1803, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. VIII, p. 223.

The spread of the Unitarian faith was one of his vital concerns. He felt sure that, if thinking men had the courage of their convictions, they would all be Unitarians,[22] and help restore Christianity to its primitve simplicity.[23] It was a mystery to him how, in the enlightened nineteenth century, they could honestly hold to the old ". . . Platonic mysticisms that three are one, and one is three".[24] He was also convinced that many would be won for Unitarianism, even those who had previously rejected Christ,[25] could they but hear a good defense of its tenets.[26] In 1822, he expressed the hope that Unitarian missionaries from Cambridge would seek converts in Virginia. If they did, he was sure they would be given a more whole-hearted welcome than would representatives of "the tritheistical school of Andover".[27] He never questioned the ability of the new faith to win the great majority of Americans to its standards.[28] ". . . the breeze", he wrote, in 1822, "begins to be felt which precedes the storm; and fanaticism is all in a bustle, shutting its doors and windows to keep it out. But it will come, and

---

22 - Jefferson to John Adams, August 22, 1813, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IX, p. 412.
23 - Jefferson to John Davis, Monticello, January 18, 1824, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 287.
24 - Jefferson to John Adams, August 22, 1813, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IX, p. 412.
25 - Jefferson to Dr. Benjamin Rush, Monticello, September 23, 1800, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. VII, p. 459.
26 - Jefferson to Benjamin Waterhouse, Monticello, January 8, 1825, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 336.
27 - Jefferson to Dr. Benjamin Waterhouse, Monticello, July 19, 1822, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 221.
28 - Jefferson to Dr. Thomas Cooper, Monticello, November 2, 1822, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 243.

drive before it the foggy mists of Platonism which have so long obscured the atmosphere". It was the younger generation that he was depending upon to accomplish this result.[29] And he hoped that every young man of his day would have a part in the crusade of enlightenment.[30]

---

29 - Jefferson to Dr. Benjamin Watershouse, Monticello, July 19, 1822, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, pp. 220-221.
30 - Jefferson to Dr. Benjamin Waterhouse, Monticello, June 26, 1822, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 220.

III. The Bearing of Religion on Conduct

Jefferson's Unitarianism is clearly evident in his dislike of speculation, and his insistence that the essence of religion consists primarily in the cultivation of justice and goodness.[31] He rejected the gnostic position taken by his orthodox contemporaries who thought that, through the use of their finite reason, they could arrive at a perfect knowledge of all the doings of the Almighty. As a youth, he had loved to speculate concerning these things; but he early learned to repose his head "on that pillow of ignorance which the benevolent Creator has made so soft for us, knowing how much we should be forced to use it". When the Reverend Isaac Story sought to interest him in the doctrine of the transmigration of souls, he replied that he did not believe it is possible for men to come to a physical knowledge of spiritual things. They might far better assume a healthy agnostic position in this respect, and leave the future in God's hands. They would find themselves sufficiently occupied with the cultivation of character which should be religion's supreme concern.[32]

He was even willing to subject religion to the pragmatic test, declaring that the religion which produces a good life, must, in the very nature of the case, be a good one.

---

31 - Jefferson to John Adams, Monticello, January 11, 1817, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 73.
32 - Jefferson to Revered Isaac Story, Washington, December 5, 1801, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. VIII, p. 107.

Did not Jesus teach men to judge the tree by the fruit?[33] Surely our truest estimate of Jefferson's own religion is to be found in the character of his life.[34]

---

33 - Jefferson to Miles King, Monticello, September 26, 1814, in Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 405.
34 - Parker, op. cit., p. 294.

IV. Christian Discipleship

A. Jesus; the Man and His Message

Jefferson considered himself a Christian in the only sense in which Jesus ever desired a man to be one; viz., ". . . sincerely attached to his doctrines, in preference to all others; ascribing to himself every human excellence; & believing he never claimed any other".[35] Even when considered in human categories alone, he found Jesus to be the most sublime character of all history,[36] and the greatest of all religious reformers.[37]

He recognized the difficulty of coming to a just estimate of Jesus' teachings, since they were not committed to writing until long after their proclamation. When they were so committed, it was by uneducated disciples who had forgotten much, and who misunderstood certain of his commands.[38] His followers had even been guilty of corrupting his message by combining it with Greek speculation.[39] Notwithstanding all this, Jefferson was confident that Jesus' genuine utterances can be distinguished by their great charm, shining as they do like "diamonds in a dunghill" of later additions. He once expressed the regret that Jesus did not

---

35 - Jefferson to Dr. Benjamin Rush, Washington, April 21, 1803, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. VIII, p. 223.
36 - Jefferson to Dr. Joseph Priestley, Washington, April 9, 1803, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. VIII, p. 225.
37 - Jefferson to William Short, Monticello, October 31, 1819, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 144.
38 - Jefferson to Dr. Joseph Priestley, Washington, April 9, 1803, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. VIII, p. 225.
39 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. VIII, p. 227.

live long enough to fill in the outlines of his moral system,[40] which, if completed in the spirit of the fragments which have come down to us, would, no doubt, be "the most perfect and sublime that has ever been taught by man".[41]

As early as 1776, he observed that the gospels are a far better guide to the true spirit of Jesus than are the epistles.[42] And the most valuable part of the gospels, in his opinion, is the "Sermon on the Mount", which, he believed, should be made the "central point of Union" for all the denominations of Christendom.[43] He was pleased to note that the teachings to be found therein (all of which tend to promote the happiness of man)[44] are simple enough to be understood by a child.[45] In 1776 (?), he accepted Locke's position that faith and repentance are the great Christian fundamentals; the former calling for a belief in Jesus as the promised messiah, the latter demanding good works as a proof of its genuineness.[46] By 1822, however, his fundamentals were simplified to the loving of God with all one's heart, and one's neighbor as oneself.[47]

---

40 - Jefferson to William Short, Monticello, October 31, 1819, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 144.
41 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. VIII, p. 227.
42 - Ibid., Vol. II, pp. 94-95.
43 - Jefferson to George Thacher, Monticello, January 26, 1824, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 288.
44 - Jefferson to Dr. Benjamin Waterhouse, Monticello, June 26, 1822, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 219.
45 - Jefferson to John Adams, July 5, 1814, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IX, p. 463.
46 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 94. This was Locke's conception of the essence of Christianity, as found in his "The Reasonableness of Christianity". See Locke, op. cit., Vol. VII, p. 105.
47 - Jefferson to Dr. Benjamin Waterhouse, Monticello, June 26, 1822, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 219.

B. The "Syllabus"[48]

It was in response to a request made by Benjamin Rush during the year 1798-99 that Jefferson decided to prepare a syllabus of his religious opinions.[49] He wrote it for the purpose of convincing his most intimate friends that the religious slanders which had been heaped upon him were wholly untrue,[50] and as we have seen, took great care to keep it from the eyes of the public.[51] Priestley's comparative study of Socrates and Jesus was no doubt influential in determining the form of his paper.[52] After briefly setting forth both the desirable and undersirable features of the ancient philosophic systems, he called attention to the degraded state of Jewish deism which existed in Jesus' day, and showed how the new elements introduced by him were intended to purify it. He decided to leave untouched the problem of Jesus' divinity.[53]

Jefferson praised the philosophers of antiquity for their insistence on the necessity of governing the

---

48 - The full title of this paper is "Syllabus of an Estimate of the Merit of the Doctrines of Jesus, Compared with Those of Others".

49 - Jefferson to Dr. Benjamin Rush, Washington, April 21, 1803, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. VIII, p. 223. Jefferson sent his "Syllabus" to Rush on April 21, 1803. See Ford, op. cit., Vol. VIII, p. 223, footnote.

50 - Ibid., Vol. VIII, p. 225.

51 - See chapter V.

52 - Jefferson to Dr. Joseph Priestley, Washington, April 9. 1803, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. VIII, p. 224. Priestley's "Socrates and Jesus Compared" was published in 1803.

53 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. VIII, pp. 223-228.

passions, but found that they did not deal adequately with social duties. They taught well the obligation of being just in dealing with one's neighbor or countryman, but felt under no constraint to cultivate a love for all mankind. Even the Jews in Jesus' day, he declared, entertained many erronious ideas concerning religion and morality. In addition to the fact that a number of their conceptions of God were very degrading, their ethics, in respect to other nations, was decidedly antisocial.

Jesus, according to Jefferson, effected the following reformation: He confirmed and purified Jewish monotheism, providing the Jews with more adequate conceptions of God's attributes and activity. He also went beyond the philosophers and far beyond the Jews in advocating a universal brotherhood. It is, indeed, this aspect of his teaching which accounts for its superiority over all others. Again, while philosophers and Jews were interested in actions only, Jesus insisted upon the necessity of making pure one's very thoughts. Finally, whereas the Jews either doubted or disbelieved in the future life, Jesus was confidently sure of it, and considered it an incentive to moral conduct.[54]

Jefferson never developed his "Syllabus" to any great length. When his enemies became aware of its existence, he denied that he had any idea of publishing a book on the subject of religion.[55] He turned, instead, to a compilation of what is popularly known as the "Jefferson Bible".

---

54 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. VIII, pp. 225-228.
55 - Riley, op. cit., pp. 78-79.

C. "The Life and Morals of Jesus of Nazareth"

The "Jefferson Bible" was begun during the same year that the "Syllabus" was written. Originally, it was a small octavo volume of forty-six pages,[56] made up of passages cut out of the gospels which treated of Jesus' teachings, and pasted in a book in what Jefferson believed to be the true chronological order.[57] All references to Jesus' divinity and miracle working power were intentionally omitted.[58] Jefferson later informed William Short that he had spent but two or three evenings on the work after reading the letters and papers of the day.[59] It bore the title, "The Philosophy of Jesus of Nazareth".[60]

Jefferson was never satisfied with this English compilation of 1803. It was his ambition to add to it the Greek, Latin and French texts,[61] as well as an original translation of Epictetus and the doctrines of Epicurus as found in Pierre Gassendi's "Syntagma".[62] He also intended to prepare similar excerpts of the life and teachings of Jesus for the use of the Indians. So far as we know, he never carried out his plans relative to the teachings of

---

56 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 451.
57 - Jefferson to Charles Thomson, Monticello, January 9, 1816, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 5.
58 - Jefferson to Dr. Joseph Priestley, Washington, January 29, 1804, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. VIII, p. 294.
59 - Jefferson to William Short, Monticello, October 31, 1819, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 145.
60 - Cyrus Adler, "Introduction", in Thomas Jefferson, The Life and Morals of Jesus of Nazareth (Washington, 1904), p. 18.
61 - Jefferson to Charles Thomson, Monticello, January 9, 1816, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 6.
62 - Jefferson to William Short, Monticello, October 31, 1819, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, pp. 144-145.

Epictetus or Epicurus. Nor did he ever prepare an abridged Bible for the Indians.[63]

Sometime after October 31, 1819, however, he did succeed in putting together his famous eighty-two page, quadrilingual "Bible" entitled "The Life and Morals of Jesus of Nazareth".[64] Greek, Latin, French and English texts now appeared in parallel columns, and maps of Palestine and the ancient world were inserted. He bound the work in red morocco and ornamented it in gilt.[65] The contents of the two "Bibles" are not exactly identical.[66] The larger volume begins with Luke 2:1-7, or the story of the journey made by Joseph and Mary to Bethlehem and the birth there of Jesus, and ends with Matthew 27:60, or the account of the rolling of the stone before the door of the sepulchre.[67] Eighty-one different incidents are recorded.

Jefferson could not speak too highly of these compilations. "A more beautiful or precious morsel of ethics . . ." he had never seen, and he felt that his interest in this regard should serve as proof of his true Christian spirit.[68] None of the members of his family

---

63 - Adler, op. cit., pp. 9-10.
64 - Ibid., pp. 17-18. When Jefferson wrote William Short on October 31, 1819, he was still contemplating the preparation of his larger work. See Jefferson to William Short, Monticello, October 31, 1819, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 145.
65 - Adler, op. cit., pp. 9-10.
66 - Ibid., p. 18.
67 - Thomas Jefferson, The Life and Morals of Jesus of Nazareth (Washington, 1904), p. 1; ibid., p. 82.
68 - Jefferson to Charles Thomson, Monticello, January 9, 1816, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, pp. 5-6.

knew of their existence until after his death. They then discoverd from a letter addressed to a friend that he was in the habit of reading from the larger volume before retiring for the night.[69] In 1904, the government printing office printed and bound nine thousand copies by phololothographic process under authorization of the fifty-seventh congress.[70]

---

69 - T. J. Randolph to H. S. Randall, in Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 672.
70 - Adler, op. cit., p. 19.

V. The Bible as a Moral and Religious Guide

Jefferson was an earnest student, not only of the gospels, but of the entire Bible. His overseer states that he frequently found him engaged in reading it.[71] While his works do not contain a great many biblical references, there are a number scattered throughout his "Notes on Religion" and private correspondence.[72] In 1808, he was interested in Charles Thompson's translation of the Septuagint, and wrote him several letters concerning it.[73] When Samuel Greenhow informed him that there were families in Virginia who did not possess a Bible, and requested a contribution for the Bible society he represented, Jefferson replied (January 31, 1814) that he was surprised to hear of such a situation, and enclosed a gift of fifty dollars.[74]

If he could not join the orthodox in acknowledging the literal inspiration of the Bible, he could fully appreciate it as an incomparable guide for the development of the inner life. He was even ready to accept, on the authority of

---

71 - Pierson, op. cit., p. 119.
72 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 95; ibid., Vol. II, p. 101; Jefferson to Jared Sparks, Monticello, February 4, 1824, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 293; Jefferson to Dr. Benjamin Waterhouse, Monticello, June 26, 1822, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 219.
73 - Jefferson to Charles Thomson, January 11, 1808, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IX, p. 173; Jefferson to Charles Thomson, December 25, 1808, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IX, p. 234. Charles Thomson was secretary of the First Continental Congress. See Adler, op. cit., p. 14.
74 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 401.

of the writers, all that did not contradict the laws of nature.[75] The Quakers, in his opinion, had learned how to truly judge it according to ". . . the dictates of common sense & common morality".[76] He loved to quote the fifteenth psalm as a means of winning his young friends to high moral standards.[77] In times of sorrow, he found great consolation in both testaments.[78] He read them up to the very last; Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides and the Bible constituting most of his reading during his last illness.[79]

---

75 - Jefferson to Peter Carr, Paris, August 10, 1787, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 430.
76 - Jefferson to Elbridge Gerry, Washington, March 29, 1801, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. VIII, p. 42.
77 - T. J. Randolph to H. S. Randall, in Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 672.
78 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, pp. 101-102.
79 - Ibid., Vol. III, p. 539.

VI. Trust in Divine Providence

Although Jefferson believed God to be so infinitely far above man that nothing the latter may do can give the former either pleasure or pain,[80] he was convinced that, as an overruling providence, God delights in man's temporal and eternal happiness,[81] and will, ultimately, bring about the triumph of the right.[82] Since God had blessed him so abundantly in the past, he was perfectly willing to trust him for the future.[83] He could but obey the dictates of his conscience, and leave the issue in God's hands.[84]

He felt sure that God never intended any man to be perfectly happy. Even the most fortunate he found to be harassed by calamities and misfortunes.[85] "We have", he said, "no rose without it's thorn; no pleasure without alloy. It is the law of our existence; & we must acquiesce".[86] His experience taught him that the only way to overcome one's difficulties and find contentment is to resign oneself completely to the divine will. One only increases one's calamities by trying to escape from them. But by conforming one's will to the will of God, one finds that peace of mind which

---

80 - Jefferson to Miles King, Monticello, September 26, 1814, in Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 405.
81 - Lipscomb, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 320.
82 - Jefferson to Edward Coles, Monticello, August 25, 1814, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IX, p. 479.
83 - Jefferson to Rev. Isaac Story, Washington, December 5, 1801, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. VIII, p. 107.
84 - Jefferson to Mrs. Maria Cosway, Paris, October 12, 1786, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 320.
85 - Jefferson to John Page, Shadwell, July 15, 1763, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 349-350.
86 - Jefferson to Mrs. Maria Cosway, Paris, October 12, 1786, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 321.

enables one to patiently bear the burdens of life.[87] He found, too, an added consolation in the fact that God has so ordered the universe that some good can be drawn from most evils. As an example, he cited the fact that the yellow fever was, in some respects, proving itself a blessing, since it discouraged the growth of large cities, in his opinion the chief centers of vice and disease.[88]

His state papers, addresses and private correspondence are all filed with references to the overruling providence of God. In the Declaration of Independence, he acknowledged a "firm reliance on the protection of divine Providence".[89] Most of his annual messages call attention to the many blessings his countrymen were enjoying at God's hands, whether the blessing of peace,[90] or the abatement in a fever which had been ravaging the nation.[91] His second inaugural address closes with these words:

> "I shall need, too, the favor of that Being in whose hands we are, who led our forefathers, as Israel of old, from their native land, and planted them in a country flowing with all the necessaries and comforts of life; who has covered our infancy with his providence, and our riper years with his wisdom and power; and to whose goodness I ask you to join with me in supplications, that he will so enlighten the minds of your servants, guide their councils, and prosper their measures, that whatsoever they do, shall result in your good, and shall secure to you the peace, friendship, and approbation of all nations".[92]

According to John Adams, Jefferson's suggestion for one side of the national seal was a representation of the Israelites

---

87 - Jefferson to John Page, Shadwell, July 15, 1763, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 349-350.
88 - Jefferson to Dr. Benjamin Rush, Monticello, September 23, 1800, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. VII, p. 459.
89 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 58.
90 - Lipscomb, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 327; ibid., Vol. III, p.358.
91 - Ibid., Vol. III, p. 384.
92 - Ibid., Vol. III, p. 383.

in the wilderness, led by a cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night.[93]

---

93 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 192.

VII. Belief in Immortality

Plato's doctrine of immortality had no appeal for Jefferson. He declared that, if no better argument than this can be constructed, there is no real justification for one's believing in the existence of any life after death.[94] But there are certain ethical and religious grounds which he believed sufficient to establish such a belief. It was his conviction that God would judge men according to the use they make of the reason he had given them,[95] and that a state of reward or punishment awaits them as a result of their decisions.[96] God, he was confident, is desirous of making all men eternally happy,[97] and has prepared, for those who submit to his will, a life "of eternal and ineffable bliss".[98]

It was Jefferson's hope to receive in the next life the blessing of his fathers for having lived worthily of them here,[99] and he looked forward to an "ecstatic meeting" with his loved ones.[100] Shortly before he died, he promised his namesake, Thomas Jefferson Smith, that if, in the next life, the dead are permitted to influence the living, he would be greatly concerned over every incident connected with the latter's life.[101]

---

94 - Jefferson to John Adams, July 5, 1814, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IX, p. 464.
95 - Jefferson to William Carver, Monticello, December 4, 1823, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 285.
96 - Jefferson to Dr. Benjamin Waterhouse, Monticello, June 26, 1822, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 219.
97 - Lipscomb, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 320.
98 - Jefferson to Thomas Jefferson Smith, Monticello, February 21, 1825, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 340.
99 - Jefferson to John Dickinson, Washington, March 6, 1801, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. VIII, p. 7.
100 - Jefferson to John Adams, Monticello, November 13, 1818, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, pp. 113-114.
101 - Jefferson to Thomas Jefferson Smith, Monticello, February 21, 1825, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 340.

VIII. Religion a Strictly Individual Matter

Finally, Jefferson always emphasized the individualistic aspects of religion. He likened every man's reason or conscience to a light which God has implanted within his breast for his guidance through life.[102] Man, on his part, he believed to be under obligations to obey the dictates of his reason and to seek to improve it.[103] He is, therefore, answerable to God alone,[104] not for the rightness, but for the uprightness of his decisions.[105] When a certain Miles King felt himself "called" to effect Jefferson's conversion, and wrote him with that purpose in mind, Jefferson replied that the only oracle of God on which he could rely was his own reason, and that, if God revealed to him the same religious views which his correspondent held, he would be more than glad to accept them.[106] On another occasion, he called attention to the fact that while one might grow wealthy because of the work one is compelled to do, or regain one's health because of medicine one is compelled to take, one can never be saved by worshipping contrary to one's religious convictions.[107] It is safe to say that most of Jefferson's opposition to the traditional Christianity of his day was due but to a logical application of the principle here involved.

---

102 - Jefferson to William Carver, Monticello, December 4, 1823, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 285.
103 - Lipscomb, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 380.
104 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 262.
105 - Jefferson to Peter Carr, Paris, August 10, 1787, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 429.
106 - Jefferson to Miles King, Monticello, September 26, 1814, in Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, pp. 404-405.
107 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 102. For a similar statement made by Locke, see pages 65-66.

CHAPTER VII.

ELEMENTS OF CHRISTIANITY CONDEMNED BY JEFFERSON

CHAPTER VII.

ELEMENTS OF CHRISTIANITY CONDEMNED BY JEFFERSON

I. Literal Inspiration of the Bible

Jefferson was at one with Priestley in considering Christianity to be at once "the most sublime & benevolent", as well as the "most perverted system" that had ever existed.[1]

First of all, he objected to the contention of the orthodox that the Bible is the literally inspired word of God. Why should not all its contents be impartially brought before the bar of reason? He would apply to it the same critical rules as were applied to Livy or Tacitus. He believed that he was more justified in rejecting the biblical miracles than he would have been in doubting the unchangeable character of the laws of nature.[2] His reaction to the account of the flood has been presented in chapter two.[3] Nor did he see how the sun could possibly have stood still, as recorded in the book of Joshua, without causing an earthly catastrophe. Furthermore, he knew no valid reason why inspiration should be considered as limited to the canon. He advised his nephew, Peter Carr, to read the pseudo-evangelists as well as the canonical gospels, since the writers of the former works considered themselves just as inspired as did the writers of the latter.[4]

---

1 - Jefferson to Dr. Joseph Priestley, Washington, March 21, 1801, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. VIII, p. 21. For Priestley's position see pages 54-59.
2 - Jefferson to Peter Carr, Paris, August 10, 1787, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IV, pp. 430-431.
3 - See page 35. See also Ford, op. cit., Vol. III, pp. 118-119.
4 - Jefferson to Peter Carr, Paris, August 10, 1787, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 430-431.

II. Platonic Corruption of Christian Teaching

Like Priestley, Jefferson also objected to the synthesis which had taken place of primitive Christian teaching and Greek philosophy. He was confident that if Jesus were to return to the earth, he would not recognize one feature of the Christian system,[5] but would disavow it with indignation.[6] His simple teachings had been so greatly corrupted by the philosophy of Plato, Aristotle and other mystics[7] as to appear wholly incomprehensible.[8]

Jefferson's study of church history had taught him that the doctrine of the Trinity was one of these gnostic additions; that the earliest of the church fathers referred only to the Father and the Son.[9] As further corruptions of the Christian dogmatists, he listed

> "The immaculate conception of Jesus, his deification, the creation of the world by him, his miraculous powers, his resurrection and visible ascension, his corporeal presence in the Eucharist, . . . original sin, atonement, regeneration, election, [and] orders of the Hierarchy, . . ."[10]

He was especially severe in his criticism of Calvinism for its share in divorcing reason from religion,[11] and condemned the following "mental vagaries"[12] of its system:

---

5 - Jefferson to Charles Thomson, Monticello, January 9, 1816, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 6.
6 - Jefferson to William Short, Monticello, October 31, 1819, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, pp. 143-144.
7 - Jefferson to Dr. Benjamin Waterhouse, October 13, 1815, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IX, p. 533.
8 - Jefferson to George Logan, Poplar Forest, November 12, 1816, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 68.
9 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 95-96.
10 - Jefferson to William Short, Monticello, October 31, 1819, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 144.
11 - Jefferson to Dr. Benjamin Waterhouse, Monticello, June 26, 1822, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 219.
12 - Jefferson to Dr. Benjamin Waterhouse, Monticello, July 19, 1822, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 220.

"1. That there are three Gods.

2. That good works, or love of our neighbor, are nothing.

3. That faith is every thing, and the more incomprehensible the proposition, the more merit in its faith.

4. That reason in religion is of unlawful use.

5. That God, from the beginning, elected certain individuals to be saved, and certain others to be damned; and that no crimes of the former can damn them; no virtues of the latter save".[13]

Jefferson was convinced that the church made use of dogmatic standards only because of the profit to be derived therefrom.[14] The "dogmatising venal jugglers",[15] the false shepherds spoken of in the Scriptures who "enter not by the door into the sheepfold, but . . . climb up some other way",[16] had found that no ecclesiastical system could be built upon the simple teachings of Jesus,[17] and had, therefore, made use of "the foggy dreams of Plato", "the metaphysical abstractions of Athanasius" and "the maniac ravings of Calvin"[18] to build up a system of power and profit. Since Platonism can never be clearly understood, an unending controversy had resulted,[19] and priests had been retained to explain their incomprehensible system.[20]

---

13 - Jefferson to Dr. Benjamin Waterhouse, Monticello, June 26, 1822, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 219.
14 - Jefferson to John Adams, August 22, 1813, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IX, p. 413.
15 - Jefferson to Francis A. Van Der Kemp, Monticello, March 16, 1817, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 77.
16 - Jefferson to Dr. Benjamin Waterhouse, Monticello, June 26, 1822, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 219.
17 - Jefferson to George Logan, Poplar Forest, November 12, 1816, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 68.
18 - Jefferson to John Davis, Monticello, January 18, 1824, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 288.
19 - Jefferson to John Adams, July 5, 1814, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IX, p. 463.
20 - Jefferson to Elbridge Gerry, Washington, March 29, 1801, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. VIII, p. 42.

This corruption of Christianity he held to be responsible for the infidelity of many men and women who were unable to distinguish between the true and the corrupt.[21] He felt sure that, had it never taken place, the religion of Jesus would have won the entire civilized world to its standards.[22] How foolish to demand more of church members than Jesus himself required. And how absurd to exclude from the communion of the church those who would find entrance into the kingdom of Heaven.[23] Instead of teaching, by precept and example, the Christian ideal of brotherly love,[24] Christians had preferred to fight, burn and torture each other over questions of incomprehensible dogma.[25]

---

21 - Jefferson to Dr. Benjamin Waterhouse, Monticello, June 26, 1822, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 219.
22 - Jefferson to John Davis, Monticello, January 18, 1824, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 288.
23 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 99.
24 - Jefferson to Dr. Benjamin Waterhouse, Monticello, June 26, 1822, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 220.
25 - Jefferson to Mathew Carey, Poplar Forest, November 11, 1816, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, pp. 67-68.

III. Protestant Church Government, Services and Missionary Enterprise

Jefferson's ideal of church government changed somewhat with the years. In 1776 (?), he expressed himself as opposed to an Episcopal form, and in favor of a Presbyterian form of government, on the ground that the latter was most congenial to men who lived under a republican form of civil government. He warned his countrymen that, in England, under an Episcopal form of government, the bishops were the tools of the king. On the other hand, he could not commend too highly the part English Presbyterianism had played in preparing the way for the Toleration Act of 1689. He was also impressed with the fact that, in the Scriptures, elders and bishops are represented as constituting but one order, and that, in the primitive church, the entire Christian community had a part in the election of its bishops; no distinction being made between the clergy and the laity. Second Corinthians 1:24 he cited as proof positive that the apostles claimed no superior religious authority.[26]

By 1801, however, he had advanced to a more radical position. He was now persuaded that the ideal religious society would be one freed of all paid ministers, where the individuals were free to moralize for themselves. He praised the Quakers in this regard, and made note of the fact that,

---

26 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 95-98.

having no ministers, they were never troubled with schisms.[27]

It was but natural for one who, like Jefferson, was accustomed to a formal type of church service, to be most unfavorably impressed with the revivalistic type of service in use in many of the Protestant churches. In a letter addressed to Thomas Cooper, November 2, 1822, he told about the women of Richmond who

> "have their night meetings and praying parties, where, attended by their priests, and sometimes by a hen-pecked husband, they pour forth the effusions of their love to Jesus, in terms as amatory and carnal, as their modesty would permit them to use to a mere earthly lover".[28]

He likewise had a very poor opinion of the work being accomplished by the various orthodox missionary societies which were organized during the early part of the nineteenth century. In speaking of the good which might be accomplished through the organization of a society for the civilizing of native Africans, he declared it to be his earnest hope that such a society would have more humane objects in view, and be less apt to stir up strife among nations, than was the case with the missionary societies of his day.[29] There can be no doubt but that, despite their sacrificial lives and worthy accomplishments, the early missionaries were greatly handicapped in their efforts by a narrow individualistic program, which, in large measure, justified such a criticism.

---

27 - Jefferson to Elbridge Gerry, Washington, March 29, 1801, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. VIII, p. 42; Jefferson to John Adams, August 22, 1813, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IX, p. 413.

28 - Jefferson to Dr. Thomas Cooper, Monticello, November 2, 1822, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 242.

29 - Jefferson to Jared Sparks, Monticello, February 4, 1824, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 290.

IV. Excessive Reverence for the Past - The Monastic Ideal

As an enthusiastic believer in progress, Jefferson had nothing but contempt for that outworn philosophy of life which placed the golden age in the far distant past. He would look forward, not backward for improvements in government, in science, in religion and in morality.[30] In one of his letters to Priestley, we find this comment:

> "The Gothic idea that we are to look backwards instead of forwards for the improvement of the human mind, and to recur to the annals of our ancestors for what is most perfect in government, in religion & in learning, is worthy of those bigots in religion & government, by whom it has been recommended, & whose purposes it would answer".[31]

With his eye ever on the better future which was to be, it seemed not at all improbable that the world was facing an endless development. He therefore advised Martha to pay no attention to those who were predicting its early end. "The almighty", he wrote, "has never made known to any body at what time he created it, nor will he tell any body when he means to put an end to it, if ever he means to do it".[32]

---

30 - Jefferson to Elbridge Gerry, Philadelphia, January 26, 1799, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. VIII, p. 328.
31 - Jefferson to Joseph Priestley, Philadelphia, January 27, 1800, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. VII, pp. 415-416.
32 - Jefferson to Martha Jefferson, Annapolis, December 11, 1783, in Thomas Jefferson Papers, Vol. IX, p. 1551, Library of Congress.

While Jefferson never expressly condemned the monastic ideal, one incident connected with his life is a good indication that he preferred a life lived in the midst of the ordinary family and social relationships. In 1789, Martha, who, with her sister Mary, was enrolled in a convent school in France, wrote her father that she had decided to become a nun.[33] She had been educated according to the standards of the church of England, and had reacted strongly against her irreligious environment in France. Jefferson did not reply for a few days. He then drove out to the convent, and, after having an interview with the abbess, brought both daughters homewith him.[34] Martha was introduced to the gay society of the French court, and soon lost all desire to renounce the world.[35] The subject was never again mentioned by either her or her father.[36]

---

33 - Stoddard, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 288.
34 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 538.
35 - T. J. Randolph to H. S. Randall, in Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 672.
36 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 538.

V. Religious Establishments

A. Jefferson's Attitude toward Establishments

Holding such an individualistic conception of religious authority as did Jefferson,[37] it was to be expected that he should look with great disfavor on all religious establishments. So closely did he follow Locke in the development of his ideas on this subject that some of his "Notes on Religion"[38] appear to be copied almost verbatim from Locke's earlier work.[39] The teaching of both men might be summed up in a sentence which they used in common: "The care of every man's soul belongs to himself".[40]

Jefferson, like Locke, believed that the law's province is to prevent one man from injuring another, and that it is entirely unauthorized to interfere when men injure none but themselves.[41] He even went beyond Locke in favoring the admittance of atheists and Catholics to complete religious liberty. For, said he, ". . . it does me no injury for my neighbor to say there are twenty gods, or no god. It neither picks my pocket nor breaks my leg".[42] A

---

37 - See page 140.

38 - Ford is of the opinion that Jefferson prepared his "Notes on Religion" for use in his speeches before the house of delegates over the question of disestablishment. It is not known whether any order was intended. See Ford, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 92, footnote.

39 - For example, Jefferson accepted Locke's definition of a church as ". . . a voluntary society of men, joining themselves together of their own accord, in order to the public worshipping of god in such a manner as they judge acceptable to him & effectual to the salvation of their souls". See Ford, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 101; Locke, op. cit., Vol. VI, p. 13.

40 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 99; Locke, op. cit., Vol.VI,p.23.

41 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 100. For Locke's position see pages 64-65.

42 - See page 36 . For Locke's position, see pages 67-68.

man's civil rights, he contended, have no more connection with his religious opinions than they have with his views on the physical sciences.[43] His religion is not as much the concern of the state as his health or property, and yet the state would not think of legislating to keep him wealthy or in good health. Furthermore, it is most unchristlike to punish a man in this world because it is expected he will be tormented in the next. The Christian religion demands that the greatest consideration be shown to all.[44]

He pointed out that, when opinion is coerced, fallible men are made the sole authorities on truth. And he found governments to be just as fallible in matters of religion as in matters of science. Although the inquisition forced Galileo to recant, the truth of his contentions is now an established fact.[45] Suppose, said Jefferson, that one were to follow the magistrate in matters of religion and find the latter to be in error. Would any indemnification on his part be possible? It is impossible, he argued, to make orthodoxy the basis of church establishment, since every church regards itself as orthodox, and one church has just as much right as any other to extend its authority over the others.[46]

---

43 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 238.
44 - Ibid., Vol. II, pp. 99-100. For similar statements made by Locke, see Locke, op. cit., Vol. VI, p. 24; ibid., Vol. VI, p. 18.
45 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. III, pp. 263-264.
46 - Ibid, Vol. II, pp. 99-102. For similar statements made by Locke, see Locke, op. cit., Vol. VI, p. 26; also, see page 65.

He was further convinced that religious compulsion tends to corrupt the very principles of religion it is meant to encourage by bribing with material rewards those who conform to the establishment.[47] "Constraint may make . . . [a man] worse by making him a hypocrite, but it will never make him a truer man. It may fix him obstinately in his errors, but will not cure them".[48]

A variety of religious opinion he considered just as beneficial for the world as a variety of tempers, talents and facial features. Uniformity in any department of life must be condemned as productive of extreme monotony.[49] More important still, he believed the very purity of religion itself to be dependent on a system which makes it subject at all times to free inquiry and even ridicule. He was confident that the development of Catholic abuses during the middle ages was greatly encouraged by the suppression of all heterodox teaching.[50] On the other hand, he was impressed with the fact that Christianity could never have taken root in the Roman empire had it not been for the liberal policy of the Roman government in tolerating free inquiry. This same policy at the time of the reformation made possible the abolition of old abuses. Mutual criticism on the part of the various religious sects he therefore held to be most

---

47 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 238. For Locke's position, see page 67.
48 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 263.
49 - Jefferson to Charles Thomson, Monticello, January 29, 1817, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 76.
50 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 95.

desirable.[51] After all, they are all bound for the same place. He was convinced that

> "there is not a Quaker or a Baptist, a Presbyterian or an Episcopalian, a Catholic or a Protestant in heaven; that on entering that gate, we leave those badges of schism behind, and find ourselves united in those principles only in which God has united us all".[52]

Finally, he called attention to the fact that religious liberty is an absolute essential for a free government. He knew of no example in history where a "priest-ridden" people had been able to maintain a free civil government.[53] On the contrary, he found that when the clergy gained control of the government, they frequently deprived men of their civil and religious rights.[54] Alliances between church and state had also been largely responsible for the reactionary view that the condition of mankind could not be improved.[55]

He freely acknowledged the right of the state to prevent the church from engaging in practises which are injurious to itself. For example, he claimed it would be perfectly justified in putting a stop to child sacrifices, or, during a siege, in temporarily forbidding the sacrifice of lambs. Likewise, if sedition or anything detrimental to the peace were to take place in a religious meeting, it would be the duty of the authorities to punish the guilty in the same way that a similar offense would be punished if it

---

51 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. III, pp. 263-264.
52 - Jefferson to Miles King, Monticello, September 26, 1814, in Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 405.
53 - Jefferson to Baron Von Humboldt, December 6, 1813, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IX, p. 430.
54 - Jefferson to Jeremiah Moor, Monticello, August 14, 1800, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. VII, p. 455.
55 - Sanderson, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 361.

occurred elsewhere.[56]

All other interference, however, he condemned as unwarranted. ". . . truth is great and will prevail if left to herself". She is in danger only when deprived of her natural weapons; free argument and debate.[57]

B. The Religious Establishment in Virginia

1. The First Century

Before proceeding to a discussion of the part played by Jefferson in the disestablishment of the Church of England in Virginia, it will not be amiss to consider briefly the religious situation as it existed in that colony when he began his work of reform.

With the very foundation of Virginia in 1607, the Church of England was given an established status,[58] and, from this time on, the statute books contained laws directed against dissent. However, up until 1640, these laws were not strictly enforced, and a large amount of practical tolerance prevailed. Puritans were still regarded as a part of the state church.[59]

The first code of Virginia laws, known as the "Dale Code" (effective from 1610 to 1619), was, on the whole a very harsh body of law. Among its religious provisions were the following: Blasphemers were to have a bodkin thrust through their tongue, breaking of the sabbath was to be pun-

---

56 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 102. For similar statements made by Locke, see Locke, op. cit., Vol. VI, pp. 33-34.
57 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 239. For a similar statement made by Locke, see Locke, op. cit., Vol. VI, p. 40.
58 - Cobb, op. cit., pp. 74-75.
59 - Ibid., p. 83.

ished by whipping, and speaking against the Trinity or the Christian faith by death. Captain Argall, who became governor in 1617, decreed

> "That every Person should go to church, Sundays and Holidays, or lye Neck and Heels that Night, and be a Slave to the Colony the following Week: for the Second Offence, he should be a Slave for a Month; and for the third, a Year and a Day".[60]

Following the appointment of Sir. William Berkeley as governor in 1641, more severe laws began to be enacted, and a number of Puritan ministers were compelled to leave the colony.[61] The Cromwellian regime brought only temporary relief. With the coming of the restoration, all the popular legislation of 1657[62] was cast aside, and the church was completely subordinated to the state.

From now on until the revolution, the character of the church was determined by the assembly's legislative acts of 1662. In that year, all parochial matters were placed in the hands of a vestry of twelve members, each one of which was required to take the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, and give assent to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England. No local autocracy could have been more complete. Vestries were not only given the right to levy all church taxes, but were even authorized to fill their own

---

60 - H. J. Eckenrode, Virginia State Library. Separation of Church and State in Virginia (Richmond, 1910), p. 6.
61 - Ibid., p. 9.
62 - That session of the assembly which met in March 1657 left to the people's discretion all matters concerning the church and ministry. Vestries were made subordinate to the parishes. See Eckenrode, op. cit., p. 11.

vacancies. Ministers were required to present evidence of ordination by an English bishop. If unable to do so, the governor and council were to prevent them from teaching or preaching. The reading of the entire liturgy at every service was made obligatory, and absence from service was to be punished by the payment of a fine. Recognized ministers alone were granted the privilege of performing the marriage ceremony.[63] Children born of all other unions were to be given an illegitimate status.[64]

The religious situation in the colony was by this time very unpromising. This was due to the loss of many Puritan inhabitants, as well as to the plantation character of Virginia society, and to the general moral decline of the period. The comparative isolation of the planters made it very difficult to arrange for regular religious services.[65] Only a fifth of the fifty parishes could boast of a minister, and many were without glebes and churches. As a result of the vestries' policy of keeping expenses down as far as possible, most of the ministers who came from England were unusually inferior, not only in ability, but often in character.[66] So bad was the situation becoming that laws of 1669 and 1705 provided that ministers who were guilty of the crimes of infidelity, blasphemy, swearing, sabbath breaking, adultery, etc. were to receive no favors before the law.

---

63 - Eckenrode, op. cit., pp. 13-14.
64 - Cobb, op. cit., p. 92.
65 - Ibid., p. 93.
66 - Eckenrode , op. cit., pp. 12-14.

Cobb even goes so far as to state that the majority of the clergy were "profane swearers, brawlers, drunkards, gamblers, and licentious". Bishop Meade of Virginia (1829-1862) paints the following picture:

> " . . . some who were discarded from the English Church, yet obtained livings in Virginia. . . . There was not only defective preaching, but most evil living among the clergy. . . . One of them was for years president of a jockey club; another fought a duel in sight of the very Church in which he had performed the solemn offices of religion: another quarreled with his vestry violently, and on the next Sunday preached from the words of Nehemiah: 'And I contended with them, and cursed them, and smote certain of them, and plucked off their hair'".[67]

After the revolution of 1688, the English government recognized the need of more efficient church regulation, and, in 1691, appointed James Blair commissary of the bishop of London for the colony. Blair was given authority to investigate and punish ecclesiastical abuses, and accomplished as much as could be expected. His visitations, however, were ineffective, due to a lack of cooperation on the part of the ministers, vestries and general membership. It was through his efforts that William and Mary College was established in 1693, one of the purposes of its founding being the education of young Virginians for the ministry.[68]

2. The Parsons' Cause

Following the reduction of ministerial salaries in 1758, a dispute arose between the civil and ecclesiastical

---

67 - Cobb, op. cit., pp. 94-96
68 - Eckenrode, op. cit., p. 16.

powers in Virginia which proved to be very influential in advancing the causes of both religious disestablishment and political independence. Ten years previous, a law had been passed fixing ministers' salaries at 16,000 pounds of tobacco. However, the failure of the tobacco crop in 1755 and 1756, in addition to the high taxes occasioned by the war with France, moved the legislature to reduce this salary by two thirds in 1758. The Two Penny Act of that year provided that for ten months, "all debts payable in tobacco could be paid, either in tobacco, or in money at the rate of eighteen shillings and eight pence per one hundred pounds of tobacco". While this law affected all creditors, it was especially hard on the ministers. For while others might make contracts on a money basis, clerical salaries were fixed by law in terms of tobacco. Then too, when the price of tobacco rose, the dealers profited at the expense of the ministers.[69] The latter were therefore justified in regarding the act of 1758 as a breach of contract.[70]

A clerical convention was called to resist the course taken by the assembly, and John Camm was sent to England as its representative. His efforts were very successful. The bishop of London wrote to the lords commissioners of trade and plantations, charging the assembly with treason in passing the Two Penny Act contrary to the law of 1748. A little

---

69 - Cobb, op. cit., pp. 108-109.
70 - Eckenrode, op. cit., pp. 26-27.

later it was disallowed by the king in council. It should be noted in this connection that Governor Fauquier, who was very friendly with Jefferson when the latter was a student at William and Mary College, approved of the act, and sought to keep the English government on friendly terms with the assembly. When Camm brought him the king's instructions of disallowance, he became very angry, and refused to permit Camm to enter his "palace".[71]

Virginia had no intention of submitting to the king's will. Vestrymen were frequently burgesses and members of the council, and were accustomed to exercise complete control over church affairs. They would not tolerate such an appeal to the bishop of London.[72] Fauquier published a "repeal" instead of a "disallowance", and the council interpreted it as applying to the future only.[73]

This the clergy would not accept, and several of their number brought suit for the balance of their income. The most noted of these cases, and one of the most celebrated of American lawsuits was that of James Maury which was tried in the Hanover court in 1763. The court rejected the Two Penny Act as invalid, and authorized a jury meeting at the next session of the court to decide upon the damages. At the next session, John Lewis, the council for the defendants, gave up the case, and the clergy would no doubt have secured their demands had it not been for the moving speech

---

71 - Eckenrode, op. cit., pp. 23-24.
72 - Ibid., p. 20.
73 - Ibid., p. 25.

of Patrick Henry who was appointed to fill Lewis's place.[74] Henry paid no attention to the law of the case. Rather, he appealed to colonial jealousy of English interference. He declared that any king who disapproved of a necessary law, by that very act forfeited the obedience of his subjects. The jury set the damages at one penny, and the "Parsons' Cause" was lost.[75]

Irrespective of the right or wrong of the case, the clergy were very unwise in appealing to England against their colonial government at a time when the nationalistic feeling was so much in evidence in Virginia.[76] The people were becoming more and more convinced that the clergy had no concern beyond their own interests.[77] As a result, the cause of dissent was strengthened, and interest in the establishment of an American episcopate waned.[78]

3. Agitation for an American Episcopate

The very fact that the commissary lacked authority to remove unworthy ministers was considered by many Virginians to constitute a sufficiently serious situation to demand the establishment of an American episcopate.[79] On the other hand, the unworthy clergy were anxious to avoid the setting up of courts where they might be brought to account for their conduct.[80] And the upper classes, although firm sup-

---

74 - Cobb, op. cit., pp. 109-110.
75 - Eckenrode, op. cit., p. 25.
76 - Ibid., p. 26.
77 - Cobb, op. cit., pp. 110-111.
78 - Eckenrode, op. cit., p. 28.
79 - Ibid., p. 28.
80 - Cobb, op. cit., pp. 473-474.

porters of the Church of England, would never have been satisfied with a bishop who lived upon the income of the state and yet drew his authority from the king. They were accustomed to a church which was subordinate to the state. Differences with the British crown served but to strengthen the opposition of the great majority of Virginians.[81]

Active agitation in Virginia was occasioned by the action of a united convention of New York and New Jersey which appointed Myles Cooper, president of King's College and Robert McKean to secure southern support for a proposed episcopate. In April, 1771, Commissary James Horrocks issued a summons for a convention which finally met on June 4 of the same year. It was attended by but twelve of the one hundred Anglican ministers who adopted a resolution in favor of an episcopate. It was decided that if a majority of the Virginia clergy could be won for the cause, a petition would be presented to the king through the bishop of London. Two days later, Samuel Henley and Thomas Gwatkin, two professors in William and Mary College, published a protest against the resolutions in the Virginia Gazette. For several months the pages of this paper were filled with the controversy. The assembly went so far as to pass a resolution thanking Henley and Gwatkin "for the wise and well-timed Opposition they have made to the pernicious Project of a few mistaken Clergymen for introducing an American Bishop". The coming of the revolution ended the discussion.[82]

---

81 - Eckenrode, op. cit., pp. 29-30.
82 - Ibid., pp. 28-29.

4. The Growth of Dissent

Three main causes contributed to the downfall of the establishment in Virginia; first, the political revolution, second, the appeal of the clergy to royal protection, and third, the growth of religious dissent. We must now enter into a discussion of the third great factor.[83]

Dissent gave the establishment no real concern until the middle of the eighteenth century. Although Puritans settled in the colony at a very early period, the legislative measures directed against them by the assembly and enforced by Governor Berkely made their normal development impossible.[84] Other defections came as a result of the government's opposition to educational advance. Virginia boasted of but very few schools and printing was forbidden until 1773. Berkely could thank God that

> "there are no free schools nor printing; and I hope we shall not have these hundred years: for learning has brought disobedience and heresy and sects into the world, and printing has divulged them and libels against the best government. God keep us from both!"[85]

The legislature was forced to recognize England's Toleration Act of 1689, and, in the course of time, all Christian denominations were granted a certain measure of toleration. However, with the exception of the Huguenots and German Lutherans, all dissenting bodies were required to pay parish dues until the outbreak of the revolution. Even occasional persecution was still resorted to by the authorities.

---

83 - Eckenrode, op. cit., p. 31.
84 - Ibid., p. 31.
85 - Cobb, op. cit., pp. 96-97.

Great numbers of dissenters entered the colony during the first half of the eighteenth century. English Baptists settled in the southeast in 1714, and in the northwest some thirty years later. In 1729, the Scotch Irish Presbyterians began to make their homes on the frontier about the sources of the Potomac, Rappahannock and James rivers. Lutheran and Reformed Germans established themselves in the same region. Since the Scotch Irish and Germans were performing a valuable service in settling the frontier and in guarding it against Indian attacks, the government permitted them to enjoy complete religious liberty.[86]

It was the Presbyterians who first threatened the supremacy of the establishment. Their first permanent congregation in eastern Virginia was one organized in Hanover county in 1743. Then followed an advance into the central part of the colony.[87] One of their ministers, a John Roan, was exiled a few years later for attacking the character of the established clergy.[88] Others were fined by justices of the peace for non-attendance at divine service. While the Presbyterian Church was a conservative body, and soon ceased to attack the establishment, its democratic form of government was a challenge to the "tidewater" aristocrats. In the west, it became more and more predominant.[89]

---

86 - Cobb, op. cit., pp. 98-100.
87 - Eckenrode, op. cit., pp. 31-32.
88 - Cobb, op. cit., pp. 103-104.
89 - Eckenrode, op. cit., pp. 32-34.

Methodists[90] and Baptists[91] followed the Presbyterians in winning Virginians to an evangelical type of religion which had had its origin in the Wesleyan movement and the Great Awakening. The religious zeal of these bodies was in great contrast to the apathy of the establishment. Not only were many of the Anglican clergy guilty of living unworthy lives and unfaithful in the performance of their duties, but even the more worthy confined their activities to Sunday preaching and the administration of the various ordinances. The lower classes were grievously neglected. Ignorance, poverty and immorality were everywhere in evidence. Yet all the establishment had to offer was the cold and formal type of rationalism which was even then on the decline in England. Dissenting evangelists were welcomed with open arms.[92]

A new outbreak of persecution, this time directed against none but Baptists, occurred between the years 1765 and 1770.[93] Baptists believed themselves justified in breaking the existing religious laws. To have complied with the Toleration Act would have made itineracy impossible, and only by such a system was it possible to reach people living

---

90 - Methodism was introduced into Virginia by Robert Williams whose labors began in Norfolk in 1772. This denomination grew rapidly, and, within a few years, attracted thousands to its standards. Although Mehtodists still retained their membership in the established church, their religious spirit was totally different from that of the average Anglican. See Eckenrode, op. cit., p. 34.

91 - Up until this time, all the Baptists living in Virginia had belonged to the "regular" or conservative branch of the church, and had exerted but very little influence in the state. From 1750 to 1760, however, the "separates" or evangelicals settled within its borders, and began an agitation which was to have far-reaching results. See Eckenrode, op. cit., pp. 34-35.

92 - Ibid., pp. 34-36.

93 - Cobb, op. cit., pp. 111-112.

in sparsely populated sections. The fact that whole communities were being influenced by their preaching was sufficient to condemn them as a disturbing influence. As a result, they were imprisoned, beaten and in other ways cruelly treated by the authorities. The willingness of the Baptists to suffer persecution for their faith, together with their democratic outlook in both politics and religion, made them one of the most popular of all the dissenting bodies. After 1770, their growth was very rapid.[94]

Following the ill treatment of the Baptists, a number of Anglicans began to favor a more inclusive program of toleration. On May 11, 1769, the house of burgesses gave orders to the committee for religion "to prepare and bring in a Bill for exempting his Majesty's Protestant Dissenters from the Penalties of certain Laws". The bill, however, was never introduced. One presented by Robert Carter Nicholas on February 27, 1772 proved unsatisfactory to both Baptists and Presbyterians because of its clauses forbidding itineracy and the holding of night services. With the revolution at hand, neither sect could be satisfied with anything less than complete religious liberty.[95]

C. Jefferson's Part in the Struggle over Disestablishment

As has been previously intimated, the struggle over disestablishment in Virginia was far more severe than any similar struggle in any of the other states. In all the

---

94 - Eckenrode, op. cit., pp. 37-38.
95 - Ibid., pp. 38-39.

others, with the exception of Massachusetts and Connecticut, state churches were disestablished soon after the beginning of the revolution. Nor was any great effort required to bring about this happy result.[96]

Jefferson was one of the foremost leaders in the Virginia contest.[97] In his memorandum containing a list of the services he had rendered the nation up to the year 1800 (?), he stated that it was he who originally proposed the abolition of the establishment and the proclamation of religious liberty in his native state. Only gradually, however, were his proposals enacted into law.[98] In the meantime, he was engaged in the hardest fought battles of his entire career.[99]

At the beginning of the revolution, only one fourth of the people of Virginia were affiliated with the Church of England. And although the majority of Virginia aristocrats could still be counted on for its support, many of the leaders were quite ready to effect its disestablishment. They condemned the clergy for their attitude on most political questions (especially their efforts in connection with the Two Penny Act), and found fault with their notorious loose living.[100] The establishment had further lost the respect of the people by its cruel treatment of the

---

96 - Cobb, op. cit., p. 484.
97 - Other leaders who labored in the interest of religious liberty in Virginia were James Madison, George Wythe, Patrick Henry, Edmund Randolph and Edmund Pendleton. See Curtis, op. cit., p. 330.
98 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 476.
99 - Ibid., Vol. I, p. 53.
100 - Cobb, op. cit., p. 483.

Baptists. The state convention of 1776 received many petitions calling for the establishment of complete religious liberty. Anglicans and Methodists alone supported the establishment.[101]

After declaring the colony independent of England, the Virginia convention of 1776 proceeded to organize a state government.[102] A constitution, submitted by Jefferson, but rejected by the convention, contained the following article on the subject of religion: "All persons shall have full and free liberty of religious opinion; nor shall any be compelled to frequent or maintain any religious institution".[103] A bill of rights was enacted, the main body of which was written by George Mason.[104] Madison, however, secured a modification of the sixteenth section which dealt with the subject of religion. Mason had provided ". . . that all men should enjoy the fullest toleration in the exercise of religion according to the dictates of conscience, . . ." Madison objected to this clause on the ground that toleration naturally implied an established church. Through his influence, it was changed to read: ". . . all men are equally entitled to the full and free exercise of religion, according to the dictates of conscience".[105]

---

101 - Cobb, op. cit., p. 490.
102 - Ibid., pp. 491-492.
103 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 27.
104 - The preamble was probably written by Jefferson. See Eckenrode, op. cit., p. 40. Many passages of the Virginia Bill of Rights were taken verbatim from Locke's "Two Treatises of Government". See Dodd, op. cit., p. 28. All the other colonies followed the example of Virginia in appealing to natural right as a basis for their bills of rights. See Scherger, op. cit., p. 192.
105 - Cobb, op. cit.,pp. 491-492; Virginia Bill of Rights quoted in Cobb, op. cit., p. 492.

The Virginia legislature, which met soon after the convention, exempted dissenters from supporting the establishment, and suspended the laws which determined clerical salaries.[106] The Anglican clergy were now made dependent for their support on the voluntary gifts of their own parishioners. This act was continued in 1777 and 1778, and made perpetual in 1779.[107] In 1780, dissenting ministers, Quakers and Mennonites were given the right to marry without securing a license. Finally, in 1784, all laws favoring the Church of England were repealed, and the entire management of its affairs was placed in its own hands.[108]

Despite the extent of the progress thus far made, the year 1784 proved to be a year of crisis for the cause of complete religious liberty. A bill was introduced into the legislature that year providing for a general assessment for the support of religious teachers. Christianity was to be made the established religion of the state, with the understanding that no one sect should receive any favors over the others. Every taxpayer was to be given the right of determining which denomination should receive his tax. Washington, Henry, R. H. Lee and Marshall favored the bill. Jefferson and Madison opposed it.

After its second reading, it was decided to print it, and give the people a chance to express their approval or disapproval before enacting it into law. The Episcopal

---

106 - Cobb, op. cit., pp. 492-493.
107 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 476.
108 - Cobb, op. cit., pp. 494-495.

and Presbyterian clergy decided to give it their hearty approval because of the unwholesome state of public morality at the time. Madison's "Memorial and Remonstrance", however, won the support of the people and defeated the bill. Madison took the position that, according to the bill of rights, the government had no concern with matters relating to worship or individual faith. If this bill had been approved by the legislature, Jews and infidels would have been discriminated against. Jefferson and Madison were bending all their energies to make religious liberty all inclusive.[109]

Not until 1786 was Virginia ready to enact into law Jefferson's "An Act Establishing Religious Freedom"[110] which he had prepared as an official revisor of the laws in 1777, and had presented to the assembly as early as 1779.[111] It was adopted just as Jefferson had written it, except for the substitution of a portion of the Virginia declaration of rights for some of his original phrases.[112]

Jefferson was equally proud of this act and the Declaration of Independence.[113] He prepared the following inscription for his tomb: "Here Was Buried Thomas Jefferson Author Of The Declaration of Independence Of The Statute Of Virginia For Religious Freedom, And Father Of The University Of Virginia. . ."[114] He might well have been proud of his Virginia bill, since, as Cobb states, it "ranks among the

---

109 - Cobb, op. cit., pp. 495-497.
110 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 237, footnote.
111 - Ibid., Vol. X, p. 476.
112 - Ibid., Vol. II, p. 237, footnote.
113 - Ibid., Vol. II, p. 237, footnote.
114 - Ibid., Vol. X, p. 396.

great charters of human liberty".[115] While previous to its enactment, an equal breadth of religious freedom had been practised in certain of the colonies, it was "the first law of its kind in Christendom".[116]

This "Act" made Virginians free to hold whatever religious views they desired, without such views in any way interfering with their civil standing. Section two reads:

> "We the General Assembly of Virginia do enact that no man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place, or ministry whatsoever, nor shall be enforced, restrained, molested, or burthened in his body or goods, or shall otherwise suffer, on account of his religious opinions or belief; but that all men shall be free to profess, and by argument to maintain, their opinions in matters of religion, and that the same shall in no wise diminish, enlarge, or affect their civil capacities".[117]

Jefferson rejoiced over the fact that the act was universal in scope and gave equal liberty to Jews, Gentiles, Mohammedans, Hindoos and Christians. One of the legislators attempted to amend the preamble so that it would brand coercion as "a departure from the plan of Jesus Christ, the holy author of our religion". This amendment, however, was rejected by a large majority, and no reference to Jesus Christ occurs in the act.[118] It goes no farther than to state that

> ". . . the holy author of our religion, who being lord both of body and mind, yet chose not to propagate it by coercions on either, as was in his Almighty power to do, but to exalt it by its influence on reason alone; . . ."[119]

---

115 - Cobb, op. cit., p. 497.
116 - Philbrick, op. cit., Vol. XV, p. 302.
117 - Ford, op. cit. Vol. II, p. 239.
118 - Ibid., Vol. I, p. 62.
119 - Ibid., Vol. II, pp. 237-238.

Section three states that although the enactment of the bill constitutes nothing but a legislative act which might, in the future, be repealed, the rights which it guarantees are fundamental, and, therefore, any repeal would be an infringement of the "natural rights of mankind".[120] It was supplemented by other acts passed in 1799 and 1801.[121]

Jefferson was not content merely to participate in religious reforms in his own state. His interests were world-wide. He was in hopes that his act, which was printed in the new French Encyclopedie, would have a good influence in France as well, where superstition and oppression were very much in evidence.[122] He was amazed that French legislation directed against Protestants still appeared on the statute books.[123]

One of his criticisms of the proposed United States Constitution was that it contained no express declaration guaranteeing religious liberty. However, as we shall see later, he decided to support its adoption, and then labor to secure the ratification of certain supplementary amendments.[124] The first of these reads in part:

---

120 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 239.
121 - Philbrick, op. cit., Vol. XV, p. 302.
122 - Jefferson to George Wythe, Paris, August 13, 1786, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 268.
123 - Jefferson to William Rutledge, Paris, February 2, 1788, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. V, p. 4.
124 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 109. The only religious provision to be found in the main body of the Constitution is that contained in article VI, section 3: ". . . no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States".

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; . . ."

As late as 1800, Jefferson suspected many Episcopalians and Congregationalists of attempting to establish their own particular denomination as the state religion for the United States. It was this conviction which led him to give utterance to those immortal words, "I have sworn upon the altar of god, eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man".[125]

He was drawn into a religious controversy in 1816 by the publication of one of Lyman Beecher's pamphlets[126] which advocated the appointment of a Calvinistic minister for every thousand persons in the United States.[127] Jefferson sent an annonymous reply to The Richmond Enquirer,[128] and, in a letter to the editor, denounced this program as the boldest effort the Congregationalists had yet made to secure a national hegemony.[129] He called attention to the fact that of the 974 ministers in Virginia, only 60 met with Congregational approval. Each one of the 60 was a Presbyterian, living in the region of the Blue Ridge. Episcopalians, Methodists and Baptists were stigmatized as "unacquainted with theology".[130] His purpose in publishing the reply was to warn the Virginia legislature against permitting the establishment

---

125 - Jefferson to Dr. Benjamin Rush, Monticello, September 23, 1800, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. VII, p. 460.
126 - Reid, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 65.
127 - Jefferson to Thomas Ritchie, Monticello, January 21, 1816, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 14.
128 - Reid, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 65.
129 - Jefferson to Thomas Ritchie, Monticello, January 21, 1816, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 14.
130 - Jefferson to Horatio G. Spafford, Monticello, January 11, 1816, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 13.

of a Calvinistic theological seminary in the state.[131]

He saw in the western migrations of many New Englanders a flight from religious andpolitical persecution.[132] The "Cannibal priests" would tolerate no original thinking.[133] He also feared lest those who remained behind should be subjected to an even greater despotism than they had previously endured.[134]

He had come to the conclusion that even the Presbyterians were "panting to establish an inquisition".[135] Wherever they were strong enough, he found that they denied toleration to rival sects, and, like the Jesuits, sought to control the education of the youth. He blamed the rapid growth of this denomination in Pennsylvania as being responsible for a growing spirit of fanaticism in a state which had once been the cradle of religious liberty.[136]

His opposition to national fast and thanksgiving days was entirely consistent with his insistence on the complete separation of church and state. Once during the revolution he did advocate the calling of a fast day for popular effect,[137] but that was before his state had enacted its bill of rights. During both his terms of office as pres-

---

131 - Jefferson to Thomas Ritchie, Monticello, January 21, 1816, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 14.
132 - Jefferson to Horatio G. Spafford, Monticello, January 11, 1816, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 13.
133 - Jefferson to John Adams, August 22, 1813, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IX, p. 418.
134 - Jefferson to Horatio G. Spafford, Monticello, January 11, 1816, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 13.
135 - J. G. Baldwin, "Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton", in J. G. Baldwin, Party Leaders (New York, 1855), p. 96.
136 - Jefferson to Dr. Thomas Cooper, Monticello, November 2, 1822, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 242.
137 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 554.

ident, he steadfastly refused to proclaim such national observances. When requested by the Reverend Samuel Miller to recommend a day of fasting and prayer, he replied that such an act on his part would be contrary to the spirit of the Constitution. The Constitution not only forbade the enactment of any law relative to the establishment of religion, but delegated to the states all powers not expressly given to the central government. While it was true that such a recommendation would not have been legally binding, he was confident that those who refused to heed it would suffer at the bar of public opinion. Besides, he believed it to be contrary to the interests of true religion to have its discipline regulated by the government. Every religious society, he declared, should do this for itself.[138]

---

138 - Jefferson to Reverend Samuel Miller, Washington, January 23, 1808, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IX, p. 174.

CHAPTER VIII

JEFFERSON'S POLITICAL IDEALISM

CHAPTER VIII.

JEFFERSON'S POLITICAL IDEALISM

I. Political Equality a Natural Right

Closely connected with Jefferson's religious convictions was his idealistic political philosophy which was rooted and grounded in English whiggism.[1] By incorporating the principle of natural right into the Declaration of Independence, he not only exercised a very great influence in the development of idealism in his own country,[2] but also rendered invaluable aid in effecting the overthrow of autocratic forms of government all over the world.[3]

Two years before the appearance of the famous Declaration, his "A Summary View of the Rights of British America" contained the statement that life and liberty are gifts of God, and in no way dependent on the favor of the chief magistrate.[4] This little pamphlet enjoyed a wide circulation, and secured for its author the honor of drafting the Declaration, the historical sections of which were, in large measure, copied from the earlier work.[5] Every one is familiar with the Declaration's championship of natural right; the acknowledgment that God has created all men equal, and

---

1 - Jefferson's political theories were already developed to a large degree when he went to France. Rousseau and Montesquieu made but little impression upon him. See Philbrick, op. cit., Vol. XV, p. 303.
2 - Crothers, op. cit., p. 10.
3 - Scherger, op. cit., p. 198.
4 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 446-447.
5 - Philbrick, op. cit., Vol. XV, p. 302.

endowed them with the inalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; the affirmation that governments are established for the purpose of securing these rights, and derive their powers from the consent of the people; the assertion that whenever a government misuses its powers and fails to adequately guard the rights of its citizens, it is their privilege to alter or abolish it, and to organize another of their own choosing.[6] In the "Notes on Virginia", the statement is made that women can claim a natural equality with men, although such equality had never been granted them except in civilized states.[7]

Jefferson considered it the function of government to "declare and enforce" these natural rights and duties.[8] His experience with energetic governments had taught him that they are always oppressive.[9] Hence his insistence that interference on the part of the state can be justified only as a means of restraining the citizenry from injuring each other, of compelling them to contribute their share to meet society's needs, and of providing for the impartial settlement of their quarrels.[10] But he could imagine no occasion which

---

6 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 43. For similar statements made by Locke, see pages 68-70.
7 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 153.
8 - Jefferson to Francis W. Gilmer, Monticello, June 7, 1816, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 32.
9 - Jefferson to James Madison, Paris, December 20, 1787, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 479.
10 - Jefferson to Francis W. Gilmer, Monticello, June 7, 1816, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 32. This also explains Jefferson's states' rights stand (see Ford, op. cit., Vol. VII, p. 451.), and his interest in keeping legislative, executive and judicial branches of the government sharply separated from one another (see Ford, op. cit., Vol. VII, p. 475.)

would ever justify a state in depriving them of any of their natural rights.[11] Such a system of democracy completely stripped the institution of slavery of all its moral support.[12] Yet only gradually did the nation come to a full realization of its deep lying implications.

---

11 - Jefferson to Francis W. Gilmer, Monticello, June 7, 1816, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 32. For Locke's position, see page 70.
12 - Dodd, op. cit., p. 74.

II. Opposition to Monarchies and Aristocracies

Monarchies and aristocracies are, in Jefferson's opinion, the two great evils which threaten a people's natural rights. He found that monarchial governments invariably become corrupt,[13] and are far more injurious to the people's interests than the most ill-managed of popular state governments.[14] His bitter opposition to the federalists was due, primarily, to the fear that they were desirous of establishing in America a monarchy analagous to that of England.[15] He also preferred a natural to an artificial form of aristocracy; i.e., one based on virtue and talents rather than on wealth and birth. The best form of government that he could recommend was one which would provide most effectively for the selection of a natural aristocracy for all governmental positions.[16]

Throughout his entire public career, he bent every effort to the advancement of these ideals. The "Report of Government for the Western Territory", which he submitted to congress in 1784, and which served as a model for the "Ordinance of 1787", provided that both the temporary and permanent governments of all the western territories "shall be in republican forms and shall admit no person to be a citizen who

---

13 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 254.
14 - Jefferson to Samuel Kercheval, Monticello, July 12, 1816, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 39.
15 - Jefferson to the Marquis de Lafayette, Philadelphia, June 16, 1792, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. VI, p. 78.
16 - Jefferson to John Adams, October 28, 1813, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IX, p. 425.

holds any hereditary title".[17] He considered the high-sounding title proposed for the president[18] by the senate in 1789 "the most superlatively ridiculous thing I ever heard of".[19] After his return from France that year, his hostility toward class distinctions became even more pronounced.[20] On the day of his inauguration, he donned a suit of "plain cloth", and walked unattended from his lodgings to the capitol.[21] He inaugurated the custom of sending a written message to the president of the senate as a substitute for what the republicans called the "King's speech" ceremony,[22] discontinued the weekly levées which had been sponsored by Washington and Adams, and issued an order that no official precedence should be recognized at white house dinners.[23] It was because he feared lest the office of chief magistrate should become an hereditary institution that he declined to run for a third term, and helped to establish the two term precedent.[24] His omission of Scott from an approved list of novelists was no doubt due to his dislike of the feudal organization of society which Scott admired and described so well. Scott's idealistic treatment of mediaeval society might, he feared, prove to be a dangerous influence in democratic states.[25]

---

17 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 432.
18 - "His Highness the President of the United States and Protector of the Rights of the Same". See Claude G. Bowers, Jefferson and Hamilton (Boston and New York, 1925), p. 5.
19 - Jefferson to James Madison, Paris, July 29, 1789, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. V, p. 104.
20 - Dodd, op. cit., p. 43.
21 - Philbrick, op. cit., Vol. XV, p. 305.
22 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 678.
23 - Philbrick, op. cit., Vol. XV, p. 305.
24 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 252.
25 - Ibid., Vol. III, pp. 448-449; Jefferson to Nathaniel Burwell, Monticello, March 14, 1818, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 104.

III. Defense of Popular Government

Jefferson's faith in the common people never wavered. He always maintained that they are entirely capable of governing themselves. In his first inaugural address, he argued that, if men cannot be trusted to govern themselves, it is absurd to trust them in the government of others.[26] He firmly believed that the participation of all the people in any government would insure it against corruption, since no interested party would ever be wealthy enough to corrupt the whole body of citizens.[27] New England township government he considered ". . . the wisest invention ever devised by the wit of man for the perfect exercise of self-government, . . ." And he favored the division of Virginia counties into analogous self governing wards.[28] If the constitution he sent to Williamsburg in 1776 had been adopted, it would have completely removed the privileged planters from their position of dominance.[29] It provided for the annual election of representatives in the house in proportion to the population, and the election of the governor and members of the senate by the house.[30] Again in 1783, and still later in 1794, he urged his native state to put an end to all political inequalities. Not until after his death,

---

26 - Lipscomb, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 320.
27 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 254.
28 - Jefferson to Samuel Kercheval, Monticello, July 12, 1816, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, pp. 40-41.
29 - Dodd, op. cit., pp. 29-31.
30 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 14-18.

however, was a just constitution adopted.[31] He even went so far as to advocate the enactment of universal manhood suffrage. The constitution he proposed for Virginia in 1783 provided for the election of members to both branches of the legislature by all free citizens who were either enrolled in the militia or possessed of a very small amount of landed property.[32]

Like Locke, Jefferson recognized the will of the majority as supreme. ". . . absolute acquiescence" in its decisions was one of his fundamental principles of government.[33] So convinced was he that the majority usually make wise decisions that he called upon those who differ from it on any question to examine their opinions very carefully to see if they may not be mistaken.[34] When the majority do happen to be wrong, it is best, he thought, to wait with patience until they discover their error.[35] It was also his conviction that, since the majority of all adults living at any one time would be dead in about nineteen years, the people should have the opportunity every nineteen years of choosing a new form of government if they so desire.[36]

---

31 - Dodd, op. cit., p. 68
32 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 323.
33 - Lipscomb, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 321. For Locke's position, see page 69.
34 - Jefferson to William Findley, Washington, March 24, 1801, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. VIII, p. 27.
35 - Jefferson to John Breckenridge, Philadelphia, January 29, 1800, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. VII, p. 418.
36 - Jefferson to Samuel Kercheval, Monticello, July 12, 1816, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 43.

IV. Rights of Minorities

With all his respect for the decisions of the majority, no one was more concerned than was Jefferson over the proper safeguarding of minority rights. The minority, he held, possess equal rights, and should be protected by equal laws.[37] To oppress a minority, or even an individual is to place strength above righteousness.[38]

Soon after the formulation of the Constitution, he wrote Madison that, while many parts of the document met with his approval, he objected to the omission of a bill of rights specifying those powers which were still retained by the states and individual citizens.[39] It was due largely to his efforts that the first ten amendments, with their guarantee of civil and religious liberty, were appended to the Constitution in 1791.[40]

Freedom of speech and freedom of the press were among the minority rights guaranteed by the first amendment, and given a place among Jefferson's fundamental principles of government. Said he to his countrymen upon taking the oath of office:

---

37 - Lipscomb, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 318.
38 - Jefferson to P. S. Dupont De Nemours, Poplar Forest, April 24, 1816, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 24.
39 - Jefferson to James Madison, Paris, December 20, 1787, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IV, pp. 475-476.
40 - John Sergeant, Oration Delivered in Independence Square in the City of Philadelphia on the 24th of July 1826 in Commemoration of Thomas Jefferson and John Adams (Philadelphia, 1826), p. 36.

> "If there be any among us who would wish to dissolve this Union or to change its republican form, let them stand undistrubed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it".[41]

Many times did he enter the lists in the defense of this principle. When President Washington, resenting Freneau's attacks on the administration, hinted that Jefferson either use his influence to have them stopped, or dismiss the editor from his office of clerk in the state department, Jefferson refused to do either.[42] Again, when Washington, in his address of November 19, 1794, condemned the democratic societies for similar criticisms of his policies, Jefferson became indignant and denounced the address as an attack on the fundamental liberties of the people.[43] He was fully aware of the fact that the Sedition law of 1798 was designed, not primarily for the purpose of preventing actual sedition, but rather as a means of shutting the mouths of the administration's opponents.[44] Being firmly convinced that both Alien and Sedition laws were unconstitutional, he did not hesitate to advocate a doctrine of state nullification in his "Kentucky Resolutions" of 1798.[45] The very first struggle in congress during his first term as president was over the question of admitting newspaper reporters into both houses of congress. Hitherto, their admission into the house had been dependent

---

41 - Lipscomb, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 319.
42 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 125-126.
43 - Jefferson to James Madison, Monticello, December 28, 1794, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. VI, pp. 516-517.
44 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 421.
45 - Ibid., Vol. II, pp. 448-454.

upon the will of the speaker, and but little freedom had been granted them in making their reports. In the senate they had been restricted to the upper gallery. Following the republican victory, they were given seats on the floors of both chambers.[46]

---

46 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 688.

V. World-Wide Influence of American Democracy

It was Jefferson's fond hope that every nation would, sooner or later, boast of a democratic form of government. And he looked to the example of the American republic, "the world's best hope",[47] to bring about this result. In acknowledging the invitation of the mayor of Washington to be present at the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, he wrote:

> "May it [the Declaration] be to the world, what I believe it will be, (to some parts sooner, to others later, but finally to all,) the signal of arousing men to burst the chains under which monkish ignorance and superstition had persuaded them to bind themselves, and to assume the blessings and security of self-government. ... All eyes are opened, or opening, to the rights of man. The general spread of the light of science has already laid open to every view the palpable truth, that the mass of mankind has not been born with saddles on their backs, nor a favored few booted and spurred, ready to ride them legitimately, by the grace of God".[48]

The passing years have brought their answer to Jefferson's prayer. Today it is universally recognized that his Declaration has exercised a greater influence in the establishment of democratic governments than any other single document of its kind.[49]

The great changes which were taking place in France were of special interest to Jefferson because of the assistance France had rendered the United States during the revolution.[50] During his residence there as American minister (1784-1789),

---

47 - Lipscomb, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 319.
48 - Jefferson to Roger C. Weightman, Monticello, June 24, 1826, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, pp. 390-392.
49 - Scherger, op. cit., p. 198.
50 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 59.

he had found the living conditions of the great mass of the people to be deplorable, a direct result of their government's oppressive policies. On August 18, 1785, he wrote Mrs. Trist:

> "Of twenty millions of people supposed to be in France, I am of opinion there are nineteen millions more wretched, more accursed, in every circumstance of human existence than the most conspicuously wretched individual of the whole United States".[51]

He welcomed the French revolution, and believed it would result in both the political and moral regeneration of the nation.[52] While still in France, (June 3, 1789), he consulted privately with the leaders of the third estate, and proposed a compromise between the king and the revolutionists. In July, he was invited to take part in the discussions of the committee which was drafting a constitution for the national assembly, but declined because of his official position.[53] When he heard that the French had abolished all titles, he wrote Lafayette, congratulating his countrymen on "exterminating the monster aristocracy", and "pulling out the teeth & fangs of it's associate monarchy, . . ."[54] He was, of course, dis-

---

51 - Jefferson to Mrs. Trist, Paris, August 18, 1785, in Lipscomb, op. cit., Vol. V, p. 81.
52 - Baldwin, op. cit., p. 45; Ford, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 129.
53 - Philbrick, op. cit., Vol. XV, p. 303.
54 - Jefferson to the Marquis de Lafayette, Philadelphia, June 16, 1792, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. VI, p. 78.

mayed over the great amount of violence and bloodshed which accompanied the movement, but believed the end to be well worth the cost.[55] Never once did he doubt but that a free and well ordered republic would arise out of the ruins of the old order.[56] It was his prayer that even the nations which leagued themselves in opposition to France might, in the end, gain the same measure of liberty.[57]

---

55 - Jefferson to M. D'Ivernois, Monticello, February 6, 1795, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. VII, p. 5.
56 - Jefferson to Elbridge Gerry, Philadelphia, January 26, 1799, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. VII, p. 329.
57 - Jefferson to Joel Barlow, Philadelphia, June 20, 1792, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. VI, pp. 88-89.

CHAPTER IX

JEFFERSON AS A HUMANITARIAN

CHAPTER IX.

JEFFERSON AS A HUMANITARIAN

I. Assistance Given the Poverty-Stricken

Jefferson's concern over the plight of the French peasants[1] was but one of the many ways he gave evidence of a genuine interest in the welfare and progress of humanity throughout the world. His world-wide interests, however, never for one moment blinded him to the needs at his own door.

He was very kind and liberal in his treatment of the poor. His account book reveals the fact that he frequently made contributions of from one to twenty dollars to those who were in special need, such as the aged, the lame and the blind.[2] Whenever he returned from Washington to Monticello, great numbers of poor people visited him to beg alms. It was his custom to give them notes directing his overseer to look after their needs. In 1816, a bad frost injured the corn crop, and he was obliged to send Edmund Bacon to the foot of the Blue Ridge, where a good harvest had been reaped, and where the price was very high. Bacon returned with thirty barrels, only to find that Jefferson had promised most of it to the poor. He continued to give it away almost as fast as Bacon could haul it.[3]

Although many of the poor who thus solicited his funds were indolent and unworthy, he rarely refused his aid.

---

1 - See pages 186-187.
2 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 18.
3 - Pierson, op. cit., pp. 75-76.

He once told Bacon that, on hearing their tales of woe, he did not have the heart to send them away empty handed. Bacon then suggested that Jefferson send them to him, which he did. But fearing the treatment they might receive at the hands of the overseer, they invariably went directly to the master of the estate.[4] It is safe to say that, had he not made such generous contributions to religious, educational and charitable causes, he would never have suffered financial embarrassment as the close of his life.[5]

---

4 - Pierson, op. cit., p. 75.
5 - Randall, op.cit., Vol. III, p. 334.

II. Views on Entails and Primogeniture

In September 1776, Jefferson withdrew from the Continental Congress, and, on November 5 of the same year was made one of a commission to revise the laws of the state of Virginia.[6] This commission was busy at its task from January 1777 to February 1779,[7] and in the following June presented to the legislature a great body of humanitarian measures for its approval.[8] Although George Wythe, George Mason and James Madison all played a prominent part in winning support for these laws, Jefferson deserves the greatest credit for their formulation and enactment.[9] In his opinion, his bills abolishing entails and primogeniture,[10] together with those establishing religious freedom[11] and providing for a general education,[12] could be made a substantial basis for a genuine republican form of government.[13] The first three were sooner or later adopted by the legislature. The last of the four was never completely carried into effect.[14]

---

6 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 196; ibid., Vol. I, pp. 202-203. George Wythe and Edmund Pendleton were associated with Jefferson on this commission. See Philbrick, op. cit., Vol. XV, p. 302.
7 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 208; ibid., Vol. I, p. 216.
8 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 243, footnote.
9 - Philbrick, op. cit., Vol. XV, p. 302.
10 - These first two bills were prepared by Jefferson independent of the revisal.
11 - See pages 169-171.
12 - See pages 215-216.
13 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 68-69. It was while acting in the capacity of reviser of the laws that Jefferson defended the natural right of expatriation, labored in the interests of criminal reform, proposed the gradual emancipation of the slaves, and sought to secure the admission of juries into the courts of chancery. See Philbrick, op. cit., Vol. XV, p. 302.
14 - Baldwin, op. cit., p. 35.

Even before his appointment as reviser, Jefferson had begun his war against the Virginia aristocracy. Under the system of entails, a large portion of the lower counties was divided into large estates, and held from generation to generation by a very few families.[15] This division of the state into nobles and plebians was most abhorrent to Jefferson. He not only objected to the control of the many by the few, but saw no reason why the state should be required to lose such large tracts of land in mortmain.[16] Furthermore, he found that the system was injurious to the morals of youth, since it tended to make them "independent of, and disobedient to, their parents; . . ." On October 14, 1776, he presented a bill to the house of delegates giving "tenants in tail" the right to "convey their lands in fee-simple".[17] The passage of this bill marked the birth of a more democratic and efficient social structure for the state of Virginia.[18]

The second great support of the aristocracy was the system of primogeniture, or the right of the eldest son to inherit all the real estate of an ancestor who dies intestate. Despite the fact that Jefferson himself was an eldest son,[19] he was just as much opposed to this provision as he was to the system of entails. His law providing for an equal division among all the children of the lands of one who dies intestate[20]

---

15 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 199.
16 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 69.
17 - Ibid., Vol. II, pp. 103-104.
18 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 199.
19 - Philbrick, op. cit., Vol. XV, p. 302.
20 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 243.

was placed on the statute books in 1785.[21] When Pendleton suggested that a double portion be bestowed on the eldest son, he replied:

> "I observed, that if the eldest son could eat twice as much, or do double work, it might be a natural evidence of his right to a double portion; but being on a par in his powers and wants, with his brothers and sisters, he should be on a par also in the partition of the patrimony; . . ."[22]

---

21 - Philbrick, op. cit., Vol. XV, p. 302.
22 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 218.

III. Criminal Reform and Treatment of Prisoners

Jefferson's interest in the cause of criminal reform places him in the ranks of John Howard and his fellow humanitarians. He was responsible for a part of the act apportioning crimes and punishments which was prepared by the revisers and which failed of adoption by but one vote in 1785.[23] This bill would have made only treason and murder subject to capital punishment, and would have made all other crimes punishable either by hard labor on the public works, or, in some cases, by retaliation in kind.[24]

In Jefferson's opinion, capital punishment should be "the last melancholy resource" of the state in obtaining security for its citizens, since it not only makes impossible the reformation of criminals, but also weakens the state by depriving itself of citizens who might, in the future, make it a useful contribution. In addition, he called attention to the fact that cruel laws often defeat their own purpose by winning for culprits an acquital or pardon, which would not be granted them, were the punishment meted out to them more proportionate to the crimes they commit.[25]

He was entirely out of sympathy with the principle of retaliation in kind, but was outvoted on this provision

---

23 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, pp. 476-477.
24 - Ibid., Vol. I, p. 60. Jefferson acknowledged an indebtedness to Beccaria for his views on capital punishment. See Ford, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 62-63.
25 - Ibid., Vol. II, p. 204.

by the other revisers.[26] In a letter addressed to George Wythe, November 1, 1778, he spoke of the "Lex Talionis" as "revolting to the humanized feelings of modern times", He feared the moral effect which would result from practising the principle of "An eye for an eye, and a hand for a hand, . . ."[27]

Madison informed him that the defeat of this bill was due, in large measure, to popular hatred of horse thieves.[28] Eleven years later, however, a somewhat similar bill, which substituted solitary confinement and labor for labor on the public works, met the approval of the legislature.[29] While this latter bill was prepared by a Mr. G. K. Taylor, Jefferson was partly responsible for its final form. His description of the Lyons plan of solitary confinement, which had been taken from an English model, was incorporated into Taylor's act.[30]

Jefferson's humane treatment of British prisoners of war was most praiseworthy. Four thousand British troops who had surrendered at Saratoga were sent to a prison camp in the vicinity of Charlottesville early in the year 1779. The winter that year was very severe, and the prisoners suffered greatly from lack of food and the unfinished state of the barracks. Jefferson did all he could to better their condition,[31] and, by the time spring came, they were estab-

---

26 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 218.
27 - Jefferson to George Wythe, Monticello, November 1, 1778, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 203.
28 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 62.
29 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 228.
30 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, pp. 476-477.
31 - Sanderson, op. cit., Vol. IV. pp. 274-275.

lished somewhat comfortably in their new quarters. Large barracks had been erected, and the German officers had assisted the privates in planting gardens and in securing domestic animals. Many of the officers had rented the houses of neighboring landowners. It was now reported that food was scarce in Albemarle county, and that a famine would result if the prisoners were not taken elsewhere. Governor Henry was requested to arrange for the removal of some of their number to another part of the state. Jefferson, however, protested against such an act of inhumanity, and the prisoners were not removed.[32] This kindness on Jefferson's part drew from the British officers many acknowledgments of gratitude. When he later met some of them in Europe, they did their best to repay him for his interest in their behalf.[33]

---

32 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 232-236.
33 - Sanderson, op. cit., Vol. IV, pp. 275-276.

IV. Desire for Peace

The preservation of peace was one of Jefferson's supreme concerns; war being in his estimation "of all states but one, the most horrid". The one exception was submission to injustice.[34] He was dismayed to find man the only representative of the animal kingdom continually and systematically engaged in the destruction of his own species.[35]

This desire for peace is very evident in a number of his letters and annual messages.[36] His correspondence during the summer of 1808 reveals an anxiety for a friendly adjustment of American differences with England.[37] Writing John Langdon at this time, he said, "I think one war enough for the life of one man; and you and I have gone through one which at least may lessen our impatience to embark in another".[38]

He was opposed to the building of a large navy, and recommended instead an extension of the gunboat system which he believed would adequately defend all the nation's harbors. It was his desire that the government pay its debts and promote national prosperity rather than attempt to equal England's navy and burden the nation with taxes. The federalists, who looked on the navy as an institution where the younger sons

---

34 - Jefferson to John Randolph, Monticello, August 25, 1775, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 482.
35 - Jefferson to James Madison, January 1, 1797, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. VII, p. 100.
36 - Lipscomb, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 327; ibid., Vol. III, p. 348; ibid., Vol. III, p. 358.
37 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 263.
38 - Jefferson to John Langdon, Monticello, August 2, 1808, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IX, p. 201.

of prominent politicians might find profitable employment, scoffed at what they called "Jefferson's peace policy". Despite their opposition, however, the gunboat bill was enacted into law during the 1804-1805 session of congress.[39]

With the eye of a seer Jefferson looked forward to the day when all nations would

> "submit the decision of their contests to civil tribunals; and the whole species . . . [would] become a great society, one common family, governed by the same spirit, by common laws, & enjoying all the felicity of which human nature is susceptible".[40]

---

39 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, pp. 125-131.
40 - Thomas Jefferson Papers, Vol. CCXXXIV, p. 41855, Library of Congress.

V. Treatment Accorded the Indians

No one was a better friend of the Indians than was Jefferson. When but a small boy, his father frequently entertained them in his home; and it was due to these contacts that he ever afterward retained a liking for the race.[41] Since the whites had deprived them of their lands and forced them to live within such narrow limits that it was impossible to earn a good livelihood by hunting and fishing, he considered it the duty of the national government to provide for their vocational and moral training.[42] He believed that the intermingling of the two races would be advantageous to both, since, as the Indians were civilized, more and more land would be made available for the whites.[43] In his second inaugural address, he could report that, during the past four years, they had been given instruction in the most necessary fields, provided with various implements and protected by the law.[44] With the passing years, he found them more and more willing to give up their savage life, and practise the arts and industries of civilized life.[45]

He insisted, however, that the Indians "had the full, undivided & independant sovereignty [of their land] as long as they chose to keep it. . . ",[46] and would agree to no cession

---

41 - Stoddard, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 181.
42 - Lipscomb, op. cit., Vol. III, pp. 378-379.
43 - Jefferson to Benjamin Hawkins, Washington, February 18, 1803, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. VIII, pp. 213-215.
44 - Lipscomb, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 379.
45 - See Jefferson's first, third and eighth annual messages to congress. Lipscomb, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 328; ibid., Vol. III, pp. 354-355; ibid., Vol. III, p. 480.
46 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 219.

of it unless it was done peaceably, and in return for what they considered an equal value.[47] Once he declared that a war against the whites who encroached on Indian lands would be more just and less expensive than a war against the Indians.[48] He recommended, as one of the best methods of keeping on friendly relations with the Indians, trading terms which would benefit them at the expense of the whites.[49] He also made it a practise of appointing as Indian agents only such men as would adequately guard the rights of their wards. One of his agents, Colonel Hawkins, was accused by the people of Georgia of placing the interests of the Indians above those of the national government.[50]

---

47 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 39.
48 - Jefferson to David Campbell, Philadelphia, March 27, 1792, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. V. p. 489.
49 - Lipscomb, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 371.
50 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, pp. 38-39.

VI. The Slavery Question

A. Condemnation of the Institution of Slavery

> "Shores there are, bless'd shores for us remain,
> And favor'd isles with golden fruitage crown's
> Where tufted flow'rets paint the verdant plain,
> Where ev'ry breeze shall med'cine every wound.
> There the stern tyrant that embitters life,
> Shall vainly suppliant, spread his asking hand;
> There shall we view the billow's raging strife,
> Aid the kind breast, and waft his boat to land".[51]

Throughout his whole life, Jefferson was a severe critic of the institution of slavery. He did not see how any one could defend it, and still take seriously either the eighth commandment[52] or the belief in man's equality.[53] He had no choice but to regard his beloved land as morally and politically reprobate as long as the institution was protected by its laws.[54] Among his "Observations on the Article 'Etats-Unis' Prepared for the Encyclopedie" we find the following:

> "What a stupendous, what an incomprehensible machine is man! who can endure toil, famine, stripes, imprisonment & death itself in vindication of his own liberty, and the next moment be deaf to all those motives whose power supported him thro' his trial, and inflict on his fellow men a bondage, one hour of which is fraught with more misery than ages of that which he rose in rebellion to oppose".[55]

---

51 - These lines of poetry were entitled "Inscription for an African Slave", and were written in Jefferson's copy of the Virginia almanac for 1771. They were, no doubt, composed by Jefferson himself. See Ford, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 391; ibid., Vol. I, p. 391, footnote.

52 - Ibid., Vol. III, p. 249.

53 - Jefferson to Henri Gregoire, February 25, 1809, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IX, p. 246.

54 - Jefferson to Edward Coles, Monticello, August 25, 1814, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IX, p. 477.

55 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 185.

Jefferson found that slavery had an injurious effect on the character of both masters and slaves. The former were encouraged to be despotic, the latter forced to be submissive. Slaves, he argued, cannot be expected to be patriotic, since they will naturally love any country but their own.[56] Likewise, it is but natural for those who are deprived of all rights of property to steal from their masters without suffering any pangs of conscience. They are led to believe that property is founded on force.[57] History had further proved that industry never thrives in warm countries where slavery exists. Only a small proportion of the Virginia slave owners were willing to do any labor themselves.[58]

He felt confident that an overruling Providence would, sooner or later, come to the relief of those in servitude.[59] Therefore he warned his countrymen that if a peaceable emancipation were not effected, they might expect a bloody uprising similar to that which had taken place in Santo Domingo.[60] Should such a rebellion take place, the whites would have no reason for expecting God to be on their side. Said Jefferson in this regard, ". . . I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just: that his justice cannot sleep forever; . . . The Almighty has no attribute which can take side with us in such a contest."[61]

---

56 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 266.
57 - Ibid., Vol. III, p. 249.
58 - Ibid., Vol. III, p. 266.
59 - Ibid., Vol. IV, p. 185.
60 - Jefferson to James Monroe, Philadelphia, July 14, 1793, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. VI, pp. 349-350.
61 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 267.

It was to the younger generation that he at first looked for the realization of his hopes, just as he also looked to them for the successful propagation of the Unitarian faith. Those of his own age had become accustomed to look with composure on the degraded condition of the slaves.[62] But more was to be expected of youths who had "sucked in the principles of liberty as it were with their mother's milk;. . ." As late as 1785, he could report a growth in the antislavery forces in his own state.[63]

After 1790, however, the south became more and more wedded to the institution, and, from that time on, Jefferson carefully refrained from making his views on the question public.[64] Even two years before this, he had felt obliged to decline Brissot's invitation to join his "Society of the Friends of the Negroes", believing that such an affiliation would do the cause in America more harm than good.[65] His hopes for the rising generation gradually faded "into the light of common day".[66] But not his confidence in freedom's final triumph. In 1815, he declared that his "last and fondest" prayer would be for the slaves' early emancipation.[67]

---

62 - Jefferson to Edward Coles, Monticello, August 25, 1814, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IX, p. 477.
63 - Jefferson to Dr. Richard Price, August 7, 1785, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 83.
64 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 430, footnote.
65 - Jefferson to Jean Pierre Brissot De Warville, Paris, February 11, 1788, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. V, p. 6.
66 - Jefferson to Dr. Thomas Humphreys, Monticello, February 8, 1817, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 77.
67 - Jefferson to David Barrow, Monticello, May 1, 1815, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IX, p. 516.

B. Program of Gradual Emancipation

Although Jefferson once expressed himself as willing to try any plan which would promise the successful emancipation of the slaves,[68] he believed that a policy of gradual emancipation and expatriation of the after born would be the most advantageous method of accomplishing this result.[69] He considered it very unwise to make freed Negroes a part of the body politic, not only because of white prejudice, but also because of the memories of injuries sustained by the Negroes. He was confident that a mixture of the two races would tend to lower the quality of the white race both physically and intellectually.[70] Should congress ever decide on the immediate emancipation of all the slaves, he fully expected a migration of the whites south of the Potomac and Ohio rivers to another part of the country.[71]

It was while acting in the capacity of reviser of the state laws that he first presented his plan to the public. His proposed amendment to "A Bill Concerning Slaves" called for the emancipation of all slaves born after the passage of the bill. They were to remain with their parents until they reached a certain age, after which they were to be educated in some useful occupation at public expense. When the girls became eighteen years of age and the boys twenty-one,

---

68 - Jefferson to Miss Fanny Wright, Monticello, August 7, 1825, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 344.
69 - Jefferson to Edward Coles, Monticello, August 25, 1814, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IX, p. 478.
70 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. III, pp. 244-250.
71 - Jefferson to Albert Gallatin, Monticello, December 26, 1820, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 177.

they were to be provided with domestic animals, firearms and all necessary implements, and colonized in some convenient place under government protection until they should be able to look out for themselves. It was then to be the aim of the government to induce an equal number of white foreigners to emigrate to the United States and take the place of these colonized Negroes.[72]

No place of colonization was specified in the amendment; but it was Jefferson's hope at the time that some American state might, after securing its independence, offer just such an asylum.[73] At one time he even considered the colonization of a portion of the coast of Africa.[74] By 1824, however, his attention was directed to Santo Domingo as the most promising place for such an experiement. It was then reported in the papers that the chief executive of this free Negro state was willing to pay the passage of the slaves, provide them with employment, and admit them to full rights of citizenship.[75]

Jefferson realized, however, that before the emancipation of the slaves could be successfully accomplished, both masters and slaves would have to be prepared for the change. It was necessary to impress masters with the nat-

---

72 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. III, pp. 243-244.
73 - Jefferson to Jared Sparks, Monticello, February 4, 1824, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 291.
74 - Jefferson to John Lynch, Monticello, January 21, 1811, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IX, pp. 303-304; Jefferson to Dr. Thomas Humphreys, Monticello, February 8, 1817, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 76.
75 - Jefferson to Jared Sparks, Monticello, February 4, 1824, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, pp. 291-292.

ural rights of their slaves, and equally necessary to prepare the latter for participation in industry and self government.[76] In his "Notes on Virginia", Jefferson advocated the industrial training of the slaves at public expense.[77] He was convinced that, when freed, they would be sufficiently industrious to insure their prosperity.[78] He also insisted that no plan would be just which did not adequately compensate slave owners for the losses they would sustain.[79]

Slaves convicted of insurgency easily won his sympathy, and he urged that they be sent to Sierre Leone instead of being executed.[80] Acting on the request of the Virginia legislature in 1802, he corresponded with Rufus King, the United States' minister to Great Britain, in an effort to secure the permission of the Sierre Leone Company for the admission of a number of these Negroes. His request was refused, as was a similar one made to Portugal for their colonization in one of her South American possessions.[81]

C. Efforts Directed toward the Freeing of the Slaves

Jefferson's very first legislative efforts were directed to the task of securing for Virginia slave owners the right to free their slaves without taking them out of the state.[82] According to the laws in force when he became

---

76 - Jefferson to David Barrow, Monticello, May 1, 1815, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IX, p. 516.
77 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 243.
78 - Jefferson to Miss Fanny Wright, Monticello, August 7, 1825, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 344.
79 - Jefferson to Jared Sparks, Monticello, February 4, 1824, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 290.
80 - Jefferson to the United States Minister to Great Britain, Washington, July 13,1802, in Ford, op. cit., Vol.VIII,p.161.
81 - Jefferson to John Lynch, Monticello, January 21, 1811, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IX, p. 303.
82 - Philbrick, op. cit., Vol. XV, p. 302.

a member of the house of burgesses, no slave could be so freed in Virginia "except for some meritorious service, to be adjudged and allowed by the Governor and Council".[83] In 1769, he prepared a bill for the repeal of this law, and persuaded Colonel Bland to present it to the house. Bland was denounced by his fellow members, and the bill failed of adoption.[84] Not until 1782 was such a bill enacted into law.[85]

Jefferson was always a determined opponent of the slave trade. The original Declaration of Independence, as submitted by him, contained the following condemnation of the king of England for his obstruction of the colonists' efforts to abolish it:

> "He has waged cruel war against human nature itself, violating it's most sacred rights of life and liberty in the persons of a distant people who never offended him, captivating & carrying them into slavery in another hemisphere, or to incur miserable death on their transportation thither. This piratical warfare, the opporbrium of I N F I D E L powers, is the warfare of the C H R I S T I A N king of Great Britain. Determined to keep open a market where M E N should be bought & sold, he has prostituted his negative for suppressing every legislative attempt to prohibit or to restrain this execrable commerce".[86]

Jefferson tells us in his "Autobiography" that it was out of consideration for northern ship owners, as well as for South Carolina and Georgia, states very unsympathetic with any restrictions, that the above clause was stricken out by the congressional committee.[87] The only important change

---

83 - Acts of the Assembly, 1769 quoted in Ford, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 5, footnote.
84 - Stoddard, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 222-223.
85 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 58.
86 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 34.
87 - Ibid., Vol. I, p. 28.

brought about in the Virginia slave system during the entire period of the revolution was the enactment of a bill attributed to Jefferson which prohibited the importation of slaves.[88]

While a member of congress, he was appointed chairman of the committee on whom devolved the task of formulating a plan for the temporary government of the western territory.[89] His report of 1784 called for the interdiction of slavery after 1800, not only in the northwest, as the "Ordinance of 1787" later provided, but throughout the entire western territory, south as well as north.[90] The willingness of this states' rights champion to support such a proposal was due to the fact that the slave trade had not yet been abolished.[91] Had his report met with unanimous approval, slavery would have been put in the course of ultimate extinction.[92]

But Jefferson would never agree that congress had any right to regulate the racial composition of a state. In 1819, 1820 and 1821, he opposed the reception of Missouri as a state under antislavery conditions. He vigorously denounced the Missouri Compromise with its establishment of a geographical line between free and slave territory west of Missouri.[93]

---

88 - Philbrick, op. cit., Vol. XV, p. 302. Ford is of the opinion that Jefferson had nothing to do with the framing of this bill. The reasons he advances are; first, it is known that Jefferson did not take his seat in the legislature at the session which adopted it until after its enactment, and second, the original draft is in another's handwriting. See Ford, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 51-52, footnote.
89 - Sanderson, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 293.
90 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 432.
91 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 668.
92 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 430, footnote.
93 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 668.

He believed that the slaves would be happier when scattered over a larger area, and that their more universal diffusion would facilitate their emancipation by dividing responsibility among a greater number of citizens. The Compromise, he feared, might even result in the disruption of the union. In a letter written to John Holmes in 1820, he declared that he was losing all interest in public affairs when

> "this momentous question, like a fire bell in the night, awakened and filled me with terror. I considered it at once as the knell of the Union. It is hushed, indeed, for the moment. But this is a reprieve only, not a final sentence. A geographical line, coinciding with a marked principle, moral and political, once conceived and held up to the angry passions of men, will never be obliterated; and every new irritation will mark it deeper and deeper".[94]

Jefferson's activity in promoting the cause of gradual emancipation has been considered in a previous section. He it was who inspired his grandson, T. J. Randolph to labor for the same cause. A plan the latter presented to the Virginia legislature in 1831 was rejected by a single vote. Jefferson had almost succeeded.[95] If the south had but heeded his advice, the great war between the states could no doubt have been avoided.[96]

---

94 - Jefferson to John Holmes, Monticello, April 22, 1820, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, pp. 157-158.
95 - Dodd, op. cit., p. 80.
96 - Ibid., p. 75.

D. Jefferson's Treatment of His Own Slaves

So far as we know, Jefferson never purchased any slaves. He and his wife inherited all they ever possessed.[97] His treatment of them was what might have been expected of one who was continually advocating their emancipation. Duke de la Rochefoucauld Liancourt, in his "Travels through the United States of North America . . ." bears witness to the fact that he provided as well for his slaves as if they had been white servants.[98] There can be no doubt but that his financial difficulties were due, in part at least, to his great concern for their welfare. When away from home, he left orders with the overseers that, under no circumstances, were they to be overworked. It was easy to find a place on the "sick list", and, on the whole, very little hard work was done during his absence. Even when he was at home, they did not accomplish as much as was everywhere required by the most considerate masters. Jefferson himself usually worked harder than any one else on the farm.[99] When unable, temporarily, to provide for all his slaves, he preferred to hire rather than sell them, since the latter course would have permanently exposed them to ill treatment.[100] He encouraged them to marry and live respectable lives by giving all who did so clothing of a superior quality and color.[101]

---

97 - J. C. Henderson, Thomas Jefferson's Views on Public Education (New York, 1890), p. 243.
98 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 306.
99 - Ibid., Vol. III, p. 322.
100 - Jefferson to Nicholas Lewis, Paris, July 29, 1787, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 418.
101 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 307.

The slaves responded to this treatment by bearing him an unbounded affection. His daughter Martha furnished Randall with the following account of his return to Monticello in 1789:

> "The negroes discovered the approach of the carriage as soon as it reached Shadwell, and such a scene I never witnessed in my life. They collected in crowds round it and almost drew it up the mountain by hand. The shouting, etc., had been sufficiently obstreperous before, but the moment it arrived at the top, it reached the climax. When the door of the carriage was opened, they received him in their arms and bore him to the house, crowding round and kissing his hands and feet - some blubbering and crying - others laughing. It seemed impossible to satisfy their anxiety to touch and kiss the very earth which bore him".[102]

---

102 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 552.

VII. Educational Interests

A. Democracies Demand an Educated Constituency

Jefferson found education to be the Open Sesame to all advancement in every department of life.[103] He believed it to be one of the best means of cultivating the morals of youth,[104] and the only means of overcoming religious fanaticism[105] and of preserving the liberties of a free people.[106]

He was expecially interested in its function of enabling a people to successfully administer a democratic form of government. It was his conviction that a system of universal education would guarantee the election of a very high type of public official.[107] He recommended the study of history as a means by which the people might be able to judge the present by the past, and so detect and overcome all efforts to deprive them of their God given rights.[108] "Enlighten the people generally", he said, "and tyranny and oppressions of body and mind will vanish

---

103 - Jefferson to P. S. Depont De Nemours, Poplar Forest, April 24, 1816, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 25.
104 - N.H.R. Dawson, "Letter to the Secretary of the Interior, December 9, 1887" in H. B. Adams, "Thomas Jefferson and the University of Virginia", in United States Bureau of Education, Circular of Information no. 1, 1888; Contributions to American Educational History no. 2 (Washington, 1888), p. 11.
105 - Jefferson to Thomas Cooper, Monticello, December 11, 1823, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 285.
106 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 254.
107 - Ibid., Vol. II, p. 221.
108 - Ibid., Vol. III, p. 254.

like evil spirits at the dawn of day".[109] On the other hand, he had never known of a civilized people who were both ignorant and free.[110]

So convinced was he that the success of the great American experiment in democracy was dependent on the education of the rank and file of the citizens that he even went to the extreme of suggesting that citizenship in Virginia be limited to those who possessed a certain amount of literacy. He was very favorably impressed with that provision of the Spanish constitution of 1814 which disfranchised all who could not read and write.[111] In his own educational bill of 1817, he provided that

> "no person unborn or under the age of twelve years at the passing of this act, and who is compos mentis, shall, after the age of fifteen years, be a citizen of this Commonwealth until he or she can read readily in some tongue, native or acquired".[112]

Two years earlier he had written Lafayette that the French people would never be blessed with a full measure of liberty until their education had prepared them to receive it.[113]

B. Jefferson's Educational Program

Jefferson fell heir to William Small's position as leader of the liberal educational forces in Virginia after

---

109 - Jefferson to P. S. Dupont De Nemours, Poplar Forest, April 24, 1816, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 25.
110 - Jefferson to Col. Charles Yancey, Monticello, January 6, 1816, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 4.
111 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 404.
112 - Henderson, op. cit., pp. 344-345.
113 - Jefferson to the Marquis De Lafayette, Monticello, February 14, 1815, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. IX, p. 505.

the latter's departure in 1764.[114] As a reviser of the laws, he recommended the adoption of three educational bills; one "for the more general diffusion of knowledge", another for the transformation of William and Mary College into a state university, and a third for the establishment of a public library at Richmond.[115]

Had his bill for the more general diffusion of knowledge been approved by the legislature, the highest education that the state could offer would have been made available for the very poorest children.[116] It called for the annual election of three aldermen in every county who were to divide their county into "hundreds", and build a school house in each "hundred" at a place designated by the electors. At these schools, all free boys and girls were to receive three years of free training in reading, writing and arithmetic. Above the common school was to be the grammar school, extablished through the joint cooperation of the various counties. Here the child was to be instructed in Latin, Greek, English, grammar, geography and higher arithmetic. Overseers were to select each year the most promising boy from each of the common schools who could not afford a higher education, and were to send him to the nearest grammar school, where he was to receive a free education for one or two years. The most gifted of this group were to

---

114 - William and Mary College Quarterly, Historical Magazine, Vol. XIV, p. 76 (October, 1905), See page 50.
115 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 66-67.
116 - Adams, op. cit., pp. 31-34.

be sent to William and Mary College for three years' additional training. Students who were not "foundationers" might attend both the grammar schools and college at their own expense.[117] A distinct advance was made by including girls in the plan. It was not until 1789 that girls were permitted to attend the Boston public schools.[118]

Jefferson regarded his provisions for elementary instruction as the most important part of the bill. Writing to Joseph C. Cabell on January 13, 1823, he said:

> "Were it necessary to give up either the Primaries or the University, I would rather abandon the last, because it is safer to have a whole people respectably enlightened than a few in a high state of science and the many in ignorance".[119]

No action was taken on any of the bills until 1796;[120] and then all that was done was to make a provision for elementary schools which failed to accomplish the desired results because of the option given the courts.[121] The original bill had provided that residents of the county should pay for the cost of the schools in proportion to their general tax rate. It was now decided that each court should determine for itself the advisability of inaugurating the system within its own county. The justices, who belonged to the wealthy class, were unwilling to tax themselves for the education of the poor.[122] Not until after Jefferson's

---

117 - This bill was presented to the legislature in 1779. See Ford, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 221-229; Adams, op. cit., pp. 31-34.
118 - Ibid., pp. 31-34.
119 - Jefferson to Joseph C. Cabell, January 13, 1823 quoted in Adams, op. cit., p. 34.
120 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 67.
121 - Ibid., Vol. VII, p. 477.
122 - Ibid., Vol. I, p. 67.

death was an effective public school system adopted by the state.[123]

In his later writings, Jefferson favored the permanent assessment of a state tax to provide for the maintenance of all its schools; primary, ward and university. He had come to see that their maintenance was just as much a state obligation as was the improvement of roads and canals.[124] And he knew of no better way of training the people in citizenship than to solicit just this support.[125] He even favored the enactment of a constitutional amendment which would make it possible for the national government to divide its surplus revenues among the various states for purposes of improvement, manufacture, education, etc.[126]

Oddly enough, Jefferson opposed the giving of religious instruction to primary school children, not in the interest of maintaining a secularized curriculum, but because he believed them to be too immature to profit by any religious training whatsoever. He would substitute for this a study of ancient and modern history as a means of training their memories, and a certain amount of moral instruction. As a part of the latter, he would be sure to impress upon their minds the fact that one's happiness depends, not on the external circumstances of life, but on the quality of conscience, health and freedom one enjoys, as well as on the occupation in which one is engaged.[127]

---

123 - Adams, op. cit., p. 35.
124 - Jefferson to Colonel Charles Yancey, Monticello, January 6, 1816, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 4.
125 - Dawson, op. cit., p. 10.
126 - Lipscomb, op. cit., Vol. III, pp. 376-377.
127 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. III, pp. 252-253.

C. Interest in Higher Education

Jefferson's concern over the establishment of a system of universal primary school instruction did not, in any way, lessen his interest in the advancement of higher education. Indeed, it has been truly said that "Practically all the great ideas of aim, administration and curriculum that dominated American universities at the end of the 19th century were anticipated by him".[128] In addition to the fact that he believed every state should make provision for universities,[129] he favored an amendment to the constitution which would provide for the erection of a national institution of learning at Washington.[130]

He was especially desirous of founding a great liberal university in the south which would serve as a bulwark against the narrowness of New England Congregationalism.[131] This it was which he had in mind when he presented to the legislature "A Bill for the Amending the Constitution of the College of William and Mary". However, since that college was under Church of England management, all its visitors Anglicans, its professors required to accept the Thirty-Nine Articles, and its students compelled to learn the Anglican catechism, the dissenters feared lest, by passing such an act, the power of the Church of England might be

---

128 - Philbrick, op. cit., Vol. XV, p. 306.
129 - Henderson, op. cit., p. 37.
130 - Lipscomb, op. cit., Vol. III, pp. 423-424; Henderson, op. cit., p. 352.
131 - Riley, op. cit., p. 85.

greatly augmented. Due to their lack of support, no action was taken.[132] Jefferson then set himself to the task of effecting an important reorganization of studies at William and Mary.[133] Through his efforts, chairs of medicine, law and modern languages were substituted for the old classical department and two divinity schools. The chairs of law and modern languages were the first of their kind in America; that of medicine preceded only by the one established at the College of Philadelphia.[134] Jefferson was now hopeful of founding a university in a more healthy and central part of the state.[135]

In 1794, the French faculty of the College of Geneva, who had become dissatisfied with their political surroundings,[136] wrote Jefferson that they would be glad to establish themselves in Virginia if suitable arrangements could be made. Jefferson became interested at once,[137] and sought to win Washington's support for the plan. Washington, however, thought it unwise to bring teachers to Virginia who used an unfamiliar language, and whose faith differed from that of the old established order.[138] The legislature withheld its approval,[139] and, following Washington's advice, Jefferson turned to Edinburgh for a suitable faculty.[140]

---

132 - Ford, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 66-67.
133 - This was in 1779. Jefferson was a member of the board of visitors of William and Mary College. See William and Mary College Quarterly, Historical Magazine, Vol. XIV, p. 76 (October, 1905).
134 - Ibid., Vol. XIV, p. 76 (October, 1905).
135 - Jefferson to John Adams, Monticello, October 12, 1823, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, pp. 272-273.
136 - The College of Geneva had been temporarily suppressed during the French revolution. See Henderson, op.cit.,p.37.
137 - Adams, op. cit., p. 45.
138 - These teachers were Calvinists. See Curtis, op. cit., pp. 323-324.
139 - Jefferson to M. D'Ivernois, Monticello, February 6, 1795, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. VII, pp. 2-4.
140 - Curtis, op. cit., pp. 323-324.

Geneva and Edinburgh were, in his opinion, "the two eyes of Europe".[141]

Not until 1819 was there established in Virginia an institution "based on the illimitable freedom of the human mind".[142] By 1814, the Albemarle Academy at Charlottesville was in a declining condition, and efforts were being made to put it on its feet. Jefferson suggested the enlargement of the school into a college, and, in 1816, "The Central College" was incorporated. He now bent every effort to secure its transformation into a first class state university. Finally, in January 1819, his labors were crowned with success by the founding of the University of Virginia.[143]

Jefferson truly deserves the title "Father of the University of Virginia". He not only aroused popular support for its establishment, but drew the plans for its buildings, and secured its faculty, most of the members of which came from abroad.[144] From then on until his death in 1826, he was untiring in his labors for this ". . . . the last of . . . [his] mortal cares, . . ."[145]

When the university was opened, he succeeded in introducing the lecture, elective and honor systems which

---

141 - Jefferson to Wilson Nicholas, Esq., Monticello, November 22, 1794, in Lipscomb, op. cit., Vol. IX, p. 291.
142 - Jefferson to Mr. Roscoe, December 27, 1820 quoted in Henderson, op. cit., p. 208.
143 - John B. Minor to H. S. Randall, University of Virginia, August 9, 1851, in Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, pp. 461-462.
144 - Philbrick, op. cit., Vol. XV, p. 306.
145 - Jefferson to J. Correa De Serra, Monticello, October 24, 1820, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 163.

had been in use in William and Mary College. In the new institution, all three systems had the opportunity to develop on a much broader scale.[146] In his report to the Virginia legislature, Jefferson defended the European system of self government as follows:

> "It may be well questioned whether fear, after a certain age, is a motive to which we should have ordinary recourse. The human character is susceptible of other incitements to correct conduct more worthy of employ, and of better effect. Pride of character, laudable ambition, and moral dispositions are innate correctives of the indiscretions of that lively age; and when strengthened by habitual appeal and exercise, have a happier effect on future character than the degrading motive of fear. . . . The affectionate deportment between father and son offers, in truth, the best example for that of tutor and pupil; . . ."[147]

This system soon gave rise to a spirit of cooperation between faculty and students, and put an end to the old practise of cheating in examinations.[148] Many colleges and universities have since borrowed from the university its lecture, elective and honor systems.[149]

It was also due to Jefferson's influence that the new university made no ecclesiastical connections,[150] and placed its religious training upon a strictly ethical basis.[151] However, the various religious denominations were encouraged

---

146 - William and Mary College Quarterly, Historical Magazine, Vol. XIV, pp. 78-79 (October, 1905). For the introduction of the lecture system into William and Mary College, see page 50.
147 - Jefferson's report to the Virginia legislature quoted in Adams, op. cit., pp. 94-95.
148 - Adams, op. cit., pp. 94-95.
149 - William and Mary College Quarterly, Historical Magazine, Vol. XIV, p. 79 (October, 1905).
150 - Jones, op. cit., p. 414.
151 - Adams, op. cit., p. 90.

to build theological schools on the campus, and were offered the free use of the library. Becuase of its decision to establish no chair of divinity for itself, the university was attacked as an institution which was hostile to all religion.[152]

Jefferson's appointment of Thomas Cooper,[153] a Unitarian, as professor of chemistry and law was especially displeasing to the Virginia clergy.[154] Cooper had edited the writings of his father-in-law, Joseph Priestley, and had sought refuge in the United States as a critic of English orthodoxy.[155] The orthodox protested that if atheism were to be publicly taught, the state would go bankrupt.[156] Public sentiment became so strong that the board of visitors were forced to cancel their contract with him. They then used their influence to secure him a chair in the University of South Carolina.[157] Even after Cooper's services with the university were terminated, critics continued to complain of Jefferson's religious "designs" in founding the institution. As late as March 1837, the "New York Review and Quarterly Church Journal" insisted that the sole purpose of its organization had been the "corruption" of "unsuspecting youth" with the doctrines of Unitarianism.[158]

---

152 - Jefferson to Dr. Thomas Cooper, Monticello, November 2, 1822, in Ford, op. cit., Vol. X, p. 243; Riley, op. cit., p. 85.
153 - Jones, op. cit., p. 384.
154 - Ibid., p. 384, footnote.
155 - Adams, op. cit., pp. 107-108.
156 - Jones, op. cit., p. 414.
157 - Curtis, op. cit., p. 333; Jones, op. cit., p. 384.
158 - Randall, op. cit., Vol. III, pp. 466-467.

CHAPTER X.

SUMMARY

CHAPTER X.

SUMMARY

Throughout his career in national politics, Jefferson's religion and personal character were the objects of most unjust attacks at the hands of the federalists and orthodox clergy. Infidelity, atheism and immorality were the charges most frequently made use of in the pamphlets of his opponents. The clergy were especially aroused over his activity in behalf of the cause of religious liberty in Virginia, his sympathy with the French revolution, and his denial of the literal inspiration of the Scriptures. The general theological position of his orthodox opponents is ably set forth in Timothy Dwight's "Theology; Explained and Defended, in a Series of Sermons".

Jefferson was, to be sure, a true child of the eighteenth century. Besides the more general influences of English deism and French infidelity to which he must have been subject, there were certain other more direct influences which were primarily responsible for his particular religious viewpoint. The very fact that he was born and bred on the frontier, and had a father who was very democratic in all his ways made him most responsive to the causes of popular rule and religious liberty. At the same time, his early training in the Church of England fostered a devout spirit and made him familiar with the Bible. On entering William and Mary College, he became very intimate with Professor William Small whose scientific instruction, he later con-

fessed "probably fixed the destinies" of his life. He declared himself ready to accept several works of Joseph Priestley and of Conyers Middleton as bases for his own faith. Those of the former contained an able defense of Unitarianism, and an exposure of the corruptions to which Christianity had been subject. Those of the latter favored a mean between the extremes of orthodoxy and deism. To Locke, Jefferson turned for guidance in the development of his views on the subjects of religious liberty and natural right.

Jefferson's character was above reproach. He was strictly honest in all his private and public dealings, and no immoral act ever stained the purity of his life. Although an aggressive leader of his political party, he had no taste for controversy, and usually succeeded in preserving a philosophic calm. While at times vindictive toward his enemies, he was, on the whole, very magnanimous and free from malice. Like Franklin, he always had a list of maxims to recommend to his young friends. But he went beyond Franklin in identifying the voice of conscience and the voice of God.

He never made known his religious opinions to more than a very few of his most intimate friends. This was due, not only to his fear lest their publication deprive him of political support, but likewise to his dislike of controversy and to his desire that his loved ones do their own religious thinking.

Many elements of the Christian system won his hearty support. He retained his affiliation with the Episcopal Church throughout the entire period of his life, and was always actively interested in every advance made by his local

parish. He was convinced that religion's chief concern is the cultivation of virtue, and defended Unitarianism as a restoration of primitive Christian teaching. In his "Syllabus", written to acquaint several of his close friends with his true religious position, he praised the teachings of Jesus as being far superior to those of any other religious teacher. But, like Priestley, he saw no reason for paying Jesus divine honors. His "Life and Morals of Jesus of Nazareth" was prepared by cutting out the various passages in the gospels which treat of Jesus' teachings, and pasting them in chronological order on the blank pages of a book. Both Old and New Testaments proved to be sources of great inspiration and comfort to him. He was confident that the affairs of this world are under the supervision of an overruling Providence which guarantees the ultimate triumph of the right. At death, he expected that every man would enter upon a state of reward or punishment bestowed upon him in return for the quality of life lived in this world. No one was more appreciative than was Jefferson of man's individual responsibility before God.

Jefferson strongly disapproved of certain other elements of traditional Christianity. Being convinced that the laws of nature are unchangeable, it was impossible for him to look upon the Bible as the literally inspired Word of God. Christian dogma he condemned as a philosophically corrupted form of primitive Christian teaching. He found fault with orthodoxy's excessive reverence for the past on the ground that the backward look always serves to retard mankind in its progress to higher attainments. A paid

ministry, revivalistic services and the missionary endeavors of the orthodox Protestant churches were equally obnoxious to him. Like Locke, he considered religious liberty to be one of mankind's natural rights, and eagerly enlisted in the struggle to disestablish the Church of England in Virginia. Both in his native state and throughout the United States as a whole, he was one of the foremost leaders in writing upon the statute books the principle of complete religious liberty.

His political idealism is best expressed in the words of the immortal Declaration of Independence. That document, besides contributing to the strengthening of American idealism, became more influential than any other of its kind in promoting the cause of political liberty throughout the world.

Jefferson's humanitarian interests were many and varied. As a Virginia legislator, he succeeded in putting an end to the system of entails and primogeniture which had given the "tidewater" aristocrats an unfair advantage over all other citizens in the state. He also labored in the interest of abolishing capital punishment for all crimes except treason and murder. Throughout his entire public career, he was a determined opponent of the institution of slavery, and sought, wherever possible, to win support for his plan of gradual emancipation and expatriation of the after born. As president, he guarded the rights of the Indians, and assisted in their civilization. He opposed the building of a large navy, fearing lest such a policy might lead to the outbreak of hostilities. As for his gifts to the poor and needy, his overseer gave ample

testimony of his generosity and kind-heartedness. His slaves were treated with the greatest of consideration.

Nowhere were his humanitarian interests more in evidence than in his efforts to advance the cause of education in his native state. Believing as he did that the proper functioning of a democratic form of government depends on the general enlightenment of the citizens, he felt impelled to lay before the Virginia legislature a bill which would have made it possible for every boy and girl in the state to receive the rudiments of an education. He was just as interested in the advancement of higher education. The words on his tombstone, "... Father Of The University Of Virginia..." bear witness to his indefatigable labors in effecting the establishment of this liberal southern state university. It was he who was responsible for the institution's policy of keeping itself free from all religious establishments.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adam, G. M. — "Thomas Jefferson", in Ellis, Edward S. Thomas Jefferson, A Character Sketch. With Supplementary Essay by G. M. Adam. With an Account of the Louisiana Purchase Together with Anecdotes, Characteristics and Chronology, H. G. Campbell, Milwaukee, 1903. Great Americans of History Series.
Occasional references made to Jefferson's character.

Adams, H. B. — "Thomas Jefferson and the University of Virginia", in United States Bureau of Education, Circular of Information no.1, 1888; Contributions to American Educational History no. 2., Government Printing Office, Washington, 1888.
One of the principal authorities used for Jefferson's educational interests and activities.

Adler, Cyrus. — "Introduction", in Jefferson, Thomas. The Life and Morals of Jesus of Nazareth. Extracted Textually From the Gospels in Greek, Latin, French and English, Government Printing Office, Washington, 1904.
Occasional references concerning the preparation of the "Jefferson Bible".

Baldwin, J. G. — "Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton", in Baldwin, J. G. Party Leaders. Sketches of Thomas Jefferson, Alexander Hamilton, Andrew Jackson, Henry Clay, John Randolph of Roanoke, Including Notices of Many Other Distinguished American Statesmen, seventh edition, D. Appleton and Co., New York, 1855.
Study of this work made in connection with Jefferson's interest in religious liberty.

Beck, James M. — The Scholar in Politics. An Oration Delivered at the Celebration of the One Hundred and Seventy First Anniversary of the Birthday of Thomas Jefferson on Founders Day, April 13, 1914, at the University of Virginia, [New York? 1914].
Jefferson's insistence that nations should be governed by the moral law treated in this work.

Beveridge, Albert J. — The Life of John Marshall, 4 vols., Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston and New York, 1916-1919.
One of the principal sources for material dealing with Jefferson's vindictiveness.

Biddle, Nicholas. — Eulogium on Thomas Jefferson, Delivered before the American Philosophical Society on the Eleventh Day of April, 1827, Philadelphia, 1827.
Study made of this work in connection with Jefferson's character.

Bowers, Claude G. — Jefferson and Hamilton. The Struggle for Democracy in America, Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston and New York, 1925.
Studied in connection with federalist attacks on Jefferson's religion and Jefferson's opposition to federalist principles.

Budd, Henry. — Thomas Jefferson. An Address Delivered on the Occasion of the Celebration of the Birthday of Jefferson, under the Auspices of the Jeffersonian Society of Philadelphia, at the Odd Fellows' Temple, April 15, 1901, n.p., n.d.
Reference made to Jefferson's domestic affairs.

Channing, Edward. — A History of the United States, 6 vols., The Macmillan Company, New York, 1905-1925.
Volumes three and four studied as a back ground for the revolutionary and post-revolutionary periods.

[Clinton, De Witt.] — A Vindication of Thomas Jefferson against the Charges Contained in a Pamphlet Entitled, Serious Considerations &c. By Grotius, printed by David Denniston, New York, 1800.
Careful study made of this pamphlet in connection with federalist attacks on Jefferson's religion.

Cobb, Sanford H. — The Rise of Religious Liberty in America, Macmillan, New York, 1902.
Principal source for material on the growth of the spirit of religious toleration in the United States. Also valuable for its treatment of the religious establishment in Virginia.

Conway, Moncure Daniel, editor. See Paine, Thomas. Works.

Crothers, Samuel M. — The Unitarianism of Thomas Jefferson, American Unitarian Association, Boston, 1919.
Studied as the work of a previous investigator.

Curtis, William Eleroy. — The True Thomas Jefferson, J. B. Lippincott Co., Philadelphia and London, 1901.
Valuable material found here dealing with Jefferson's character.

Dawson, N. H. R. — "Letter to the Secretary of the Interior, Dec. 9, 1887", in Adams, H. B. "Thomas Jefferson and the University of Virginia", in United States Bureau of Education, Circular of Information no. 1, 1888; Contributions to American Educational History no. 2., Government Printing Office, Washington, 1888.
Occasional references made to Jefferson's educational interests.

[Dickins, Asbury.] — The Claims of Thomas Jefferson to the Presidency Examined at the Bar of Christianity. By a Layman, Asbury Dickins, Philadelphia, 1800.
Careful study made of this pamphlet in connection with federalist attacks on Jefferson's religion.

Dodd, W. E. — "Thomas Jefferson", in Dodd, W. E. Statesmen of the Old South, or From Radicalism to Conservative Revolt, Macmillan Co., New York, 1911.
Valuable material found here concerning the influence of the frontier in the development of Jefferson's religious views.

Dwight, Timothy. — Theology; Explained and Defended in a Series of Sermons, 5 vols., printed by Clark and Lyman, Middletown, Conn., 1818-1819.
Principal authority used for the theological views of the orthodox at the close of the eighteenth century. Thorough study made of all five volumes.

Eckenrode, H. J. — Virginia State Library. Separation of Church and State in Virginia. A Study in the Development of the Revolution. Special Report of the Department of Archives and History, Public Printing, Richmond, 1910.
Principal authority used for the history of the established church in Virginia.

Ellis, Edward S. — Thomas Jefferson, a Character Sketch. With Supplementary Essay by G. M. Adam. With an Account of the Louisiana Purchase Together with Anecdotes, Characteristics and Chronology, H. G. Campbell, Milwaukee, 1903. Great Americans of History Series.
Interesting reference made to Jefferson's character.

Faÿ, Bernard. — The Revolutionary Spirit in France and America. Translated by Ramon Guthrie. Harcourt, Brace and Co., New York, 1927. Original title: "L'esprit revolutionnaire en France et aux Etats-Unis à la fin du XVIIIe siècle".
Occasional references made to the influence of French rationalistic thought in America.

[Fessenden, Thomas Green.] Democracy Unveiled, or Tyranny Stripped of the Garb of Patriotism. By Christopher Caustic, third edition, 2 vols., I. Riley and Co., New York, 1806.
Studied in connection with federalist attacks on Jefferson's religion and character. Several interesting verses quoted.

Ford, Paul Leicester, editor. See Jefferson, Thomas. Works.

Hamilton, Alexander,, — The Works of. Edited by Henry Cabot Lodge, second edition, 12 vols., G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York and London, 1904.
Several references made to Hamilton's attacks on Jefferson's religion.

Hartog, Philip Joseph. "Joseph Priestley", in The Dictionary of National Biography. Edited by Sir Leslie Stephen and Sir Sidney Lee, 22 vols., Oxford University Press, London, reprint 1921-1922.
General reference made to Joseph Priestley's life and work.

Hendel, Jr., Charles William. Studies in the Philosophy of David Hume, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1925.
Several references made to Hume's theological position as discussed in chapter eleven.

Henderson, J. C. Thomas Jefferson's Views on Public Education, G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1890.
One of the principal authorities used for Jefferson's educational interests and activities.

Jefferson, Thomas. The Life and Morals of Jesus of Nazareth. Extracted Textually From the Gospels in Greek, Latin, French and English, Government Printing Office, Washington, 1904.
Studied in connection with Jefferson's religious opinions.

Jefferson, Thomas. The Thomas Jefferson Papers (1651-1826), 236 vols., Library of Congress.
Careful examination made of volumes one to one hundred one inclusive, containing all material down to the end of the year 1796. Undated volumes also examined.

Jefferson, Thomas. Scrap Book, Library of Congress.
Reference made to excerpts taken from Bolingbroke's essays.

Jefferson, Thomas., The Writings of. Edited by Paul Leicester Ford, 10 vols., G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1892-1899.
Principal authority used for Jefferson's opinions on all subjects. All ten volumes carefully studied. Of special value are Jefferson's "Notes on Religion" (1776?), "Notes on Virginia" (1782), "Anas" (1791-1806), "Autobiography" (1821), personal correspondence, and such documents as the Declaration of Independence (1776), "An Act for Establishing Religious Freedom" (1786), and "Syllabus of an Estimate of the Merit of the Doctrines of Jesus Compared with Those of Others" (1803).

Jefférson, Thomas. The Writings of. Library Edition Containing His Autobiography, Notes on Virginia, Parliamentary Manual, Official Papers, Messages and Addresses, and Other Writings, Official and Private, Now Collected and Published in Their Entirety for the First Time. Including All of the Original Manuscripts, Deposited in the Department of State and Published in 1853 by order of the Joint Committee of Congress. Edited by Andrew A. Lipscomb, 20 vols., The Thomas Jefferson Memorial Association, Washington, 1903.
Careful study made of volume three which contains Jefferson's inaugural addresses and messages to congress. Also used as a supplement to the Ford edition.

Johnson, William. Eulogy on Thomas Jefferson Delivered Aug. 3, 1826, in the First Presbyterian Church Charleston, C. C. Sebring, Charleston, 1826.
Interesting reference made to Jefferson's character.

Jones, Howard Mumford. America and French Culture 1750-1848, The University of North Carolina Press, Durham, N. C., 1927.
One of the principal sources for the development of rationalistic thought in America.

[Knox, Samuel.] "A Vindication of the Religion of Mr. Jefferson and a Statement of his Services in the Cause of Religious Liberty. By a friend to Real Religion", in Jefferson, Thomas. Notes on the State of Virginia, printed by W. Pechin, Baltimore, 1800.
Careful study made of this pamphlet in connection with federalist attacks of Jefferson's religion.

[Linn, Rev. William.] Serious Considerations on the Election of a President: Addressed to the Citizens of the United States, printed by John Furman, New York, 1800.
Used as a typical example of the anti-Jeffersonian type of pamphlet.

Lipscomb, Andrew A., editor. See Jefferson, Thomas. Works.

Locke, John., The Works of. In Ten Volumes, eleventh edition, 10 vols., W. Otridge and Son, etc., London, 1812.
Principal authority used for Locke's views on toleration and civil government. Careful study made of his Letters on Toleration and "Two Treatises of Government (1690)".

Lodge, Henry Cabot, editor. See Hamilton, Alexander. Works.

Marcus Brutus (pseud.). "Serious Facts, Opposed to 'Serious Considerations': or the Voice of Warning to Religious Republicans", in [Mason, Rev. John M.] The Voice of Warning to Christians on the Ensuing Election of a President of the United States, printed by G. F. Hopkins, New York, 1800.
Careful study made of this pamphlet in connection with federalist attacks on Jefferson's religion.

[Mason, Rev. John M.] The Voice of Warning to Christians on the Ensuing Election of a President of the United States, printed by G. F. Hopkins, New York, 1800.
Careful study made of this pamphlet in connection with federalist attacks on Jefferson's religion.

M'Giffert, Arthur Cushman. Protestant Thought before Kant, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1924.
One of the principal authorities used for a treatment of English and French rationalistic thought in the eighteenth century.

McIlwain, Charles Howard. The American Revolution: A Constitutional Interpretation, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1923.
Reference made to the political situation in the colonies.

McMaster, John Bach. A History of the People of the United States from the Revolution to the Civil War, 8 vols., D. Appleton and Co., New York, 1883-1913.
Volume two studied as a background for the post revolutionary period.

Middleton, Conyers., The Miscellaneous Works of the Late Reverend and Learned, second edition, 5 vols., R. Manby and H. S. Cox, London, 1755.
Principal authority used for Middleton's religious opinions. Careful study made of his "A Letter from Rome" (1729), and "A Letter to Dr. Waterland" (1731).

Morse, Anson Ely. The Federalist Party in Massachusetts to the Year 1800, The University Library, Princeton, 1909.
Occasional references made to the alliance of the federalists and New England clergy.

Oman, John. The Problem of Faith and Freedom in the Last Two Centuries, A. C. Armstrong and Son, New York, 1906.
Occasional references made concerning English and French rationalistic thought in the eighteenth century.

Paine, Thomas., The Writings of. Edited by Moncure Daniel Conway, 4 vols., G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1894-1896.
Principal authority used for Paine's religious opinions. Careful study made of his "Common Sense" (1776), "Age of Reason" (1794) and correspondence.

Parker, Theodore. "Thomas Jefferson", in Parker, Theodore. Historic Americans, second edition, Horace B. Fuller, Boston, 1871.
Occasional references made to Jefferson's character.

Phildrick, Francis Samuel. "Thomas Jefferson", in Encyclopaedia Britannica, eleventh edition, 28 vols.; Encyclopaedia Britannica Inc., New York, 1910-1911.
One of the principal authorities used for events in Jefferson's life.

Pierson, Rev. Hamilton W. Jefferson at Monticello. The Private Life of Thomas Jefferson, Charles Scribner, New York, 1862.
Valuable material on Jefferson's character.

Priestley, Joseph., The Theological and Miscellaneous Works of. Edited by J. T. Rutt, 26 vols., Hackney London , 1817-1831. Principal authority used for Priestley's religious opinions. Careful study made of his "The History of the Corruptions of Christianity" (1782) and "A History of the Early Opinions Concerning Jesus Christ" (1786).

Randall, Henry S. The Life of Thomas Jefferson, 3 vols., Derby and Jackson, New York, 1858. One of the principal authorities used for events in Jefferson's life, his character and religious opinions.

Reid, Whitelaw. "Thomas Jefferson", in Reid, Whitelaw. American English Studies, 2 vols., Charles Scribner's, New York, 1913. Occasional references made to Jefferson's character and interest in the cause of religious liberty.

Riley, Woodbridge. American Thought from Puritanism to Pragmatism and Beyond, second edition, Henry Holt and Co., New York, 1923. One of the principal authorities used for a history of the deistic movement in the United States.

Robinson, W. A. Jeffersonian Democracy in New England, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1916. Studied in connection with the alliance effected between the federalists and New England clergy.

Rutt, J. T., editor. See Priestley, Joseph, Works.

Sanderson, John and others. "Thomas Jefferson", in Sanderson, John and others. Biography of the Signers of the Declaration of Independence, second edition, 5 vols., W. Brown and C. Peters, Philadelphia, 1828. Valuable material dealing with Jefferson's character and humanitarian interests.

Scherger, George L. The Evolution of Modern Liberty, Longmans, Green and Co., New York, 1904. One of the principal sources for material on the development of the idea of "natural right" and the growth of democracy in America.

Sergeant, John. Oration Delivered in Independence Square in the City of Philadelphia on the 24th of July 1826 in Commemoration of Thomas Jefferson and John Adams, H. C. Carey and I. Lea, Philadelphia, 1826.
Reference is made to Jefferson's efforts in winning support for the adoption of the first ten amendments to the Constitution.

[Smith, William Loughton.] The Pretentions of Thomas Jefferson to the Presidency Examined; and the Charges against John Adams Refuted. Addressed to the Citizens of America in General; and Particularly to the Electors of the President, Philadelphia (?)1796.
Careful study made of this pamphlet in connection with federalist attacks on Jefferson's religion.

Stauffer, Vernon. New England and the Bavarian Illuminati, Columbia University, New York, 1918.
One of the principal authorities used for the development of rationalistic thought in America and the opposition of the New England clergy.

Stoddard, W. O. "Thomas Jefferson, Third President", in Stoddard, W. O. Lives of the Presidents, 10 vols., Frederick A. Stokes Co., New York, 1886-1889.
Valuable material in connection with Jefferson's religious and humanitarian interests.

Tompkins, Hamilton B. Bibliotheca Jeffersoniana. A List of Books Written by or Relating to Thomas Jefferson, G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1887.
A valuable bibliography.

Walker, Williston. A History of the Christian Church, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1919.
Occasional references made to the religious situation which existed in the United States during the eighteenth century.

The National Cyclopaedia of American Biography, 21 vols., James T. White and Co., New York, 1898-1927.
General reference made to Timothy Dwight's life and work.

The Temple of Reason (weekly magazine), D. Driscol, Philadelphia, Nov. 8, 1800 - Jan. 7, 1802.
References made to the widespread belief that Jefferson was a deist.

William and Mary College Quarterly, Historical Magazine, 27 vols., William and Mary College, Williamsburg, Va., 1892-1919. Principal authority used for the influence of Professor William Small on Jefferson's intellectual outlook. References made to volumes three, six, eight and fourteen.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY

William Drum Gould, the son of William H. G. Gould and Myrtle Drum Gould, was born in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania on August 8, 1897; attended the Martha Washington and Belmont Grammar Schools of Philadelphia, was graduated from the Central High School, Philadelphia in 1915 with the A. B. degree, Wesleyan University in 1919 with the A. B. degree, and Garrett Biblical Institute in 1922 with the B. D. degree. He is a member of the Alpha Chi Rho and Phi Beta Kappa Fraternities.

Ideal
Double Reversible
Manuscript Cover
PATENTED NOV. 15, 1898
Manufactured by
Adams, Cushing & Foster